

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, o/o S.P.C.K.
HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2, to whom MSS.
should be sent.

Vol. XXVIII

MAY, 1934

No. 167

EDITORIAL

THE most interesting thing about this number of THEOLOGY is that all the four articles are by lay writers. It would not, and should not, normally so happen, but when for once it does so happen it is a fortunate coincidence. Gone are the old days when the function of the more exalted laity could be defined, as it was by Newman's correspondent, Monsignor Talbot, "to hunt, to shoot, to entertain," and that of the undistinguished majority was not much more than the humble duty performed by "The Northern Farmer"—

An' I hallus coom'd to 's church afoor moy Sally wur deäð,
An' 'eard 'um a bummin' awaäy loike a buzzard-clock ower my 'eäð,
An' I niver knaw'd whot a meän'd, but I thowt a 'ad summut to saäy,
An' I thowt a said whot a owt to 'a said, an' I coom'd awaäy.

That day is gone. It is quite true that the clergy are still constantly discovering unexpected and distressing depths of ignorance in their lay friends, even in the devout members of congregations. Some of it is no doubt due to the fact that the language of the pulpit has been over-technical, unrelated to the vocabulary of the arts and sciences and of ordinary life. A Public School boy once complained that in sermons the School Chapel was always referred to as "Sion," and that in other respects too the terminology was unnatural. But that was in 1900. It is also due to the strange belief of some that knowledge of theology, like Dogberry's reading and writing, comes by nature. Lay knowledge of theology is often like Mr. Riley's knowledge of Latin in *The Mill on the Floss*. He had brought away with him from the Mudport Free School a sense of understanding Latin generally, but his comprehension of any particular Latin was not ready.

Nevertheless, a number of laymen and laywomen are thoughtful and widely read students of theology. The fact is, incidentally, a notable stimulus to the clergy, and is, in itself, a clear and great gain. Only that very rare person, the thoroughly obscurantist priest, would ever complain that the congregation knew too much. The range of the Catholic Faith is so vast, the depths to which devout thought can penetrate are so profound, that the preacher or the counsellor who has read and thought and prayed will be led to say that which will be of profit to the hearers. And it does not happen that the most educated lay people are impatient. They are of course rightly impatient of carelessness and shallowness and ignorant complacency. But the more they know of Christian theology, the more regard they have for the priesthood. St. Francis de Sales, himself a model of filial piety, was confessor to his own parents. This is far more than could commonly be accomplished on either side, and is indeed not to be recommended, but there is happily many a parish where men and women of ripe age and wisdom combine a parental solicitude for the welfare of a young priest with a filial regard for his office. Is there harm in this? Was Mr. Gladstone a weak specimen of humanity? And were the young curates at Hawarden illegitimately uplifted by his eager attention to their words? Or were they stirred to humility and fresh resolve? Let the clergy remember that their own place in the economy of the Church is always secure, and let them welcome enthusiastically the signs of increased learning in the laity.

Many of us are justly offended by the newspaper trick of collecting opinions on such subjects as Immortality from persons who are eminent as novelists or boxers or in some other innocent but irrelevant way of life, as if their fancies were important. All that is trivial, sometimes noxious. But the testimony of genuine Christians is a different matter. And it is, in point of fact, noticeably coherent and noticeably orthodox. Father D'Arcy is not one who is disposed to pin all his faith to the argument from religious experience. But he says, "Is it not remarkable that the cold intellectualism of Aquinas proved a word of life to Ruysbroeck, Suso and others of their school, that the philosophical conception and mystical experience bear each other out, that Teresa of Avila found her experience of God's presence in three ways was identical with the analysis of the theologians whom she had not read?" (*The Nature of Belief*, p. 233). On a later page, after quoting what might

be described by some as a series of very remarkable coincidences, he says, "This is astonishing, but what are we to think when we find that this same lofty intellectual structure fitted the facts of history and provided a garden in which devotion and the highest religious and mystical experience could thrive?" (p. 314). It can hardly be claimed that mystical experience is always verified by theology, nor is it suggested that all laymen are mystics, but the total number of people who, having made some progress in what may be called experimental religion, find themselves driven to say, "I see now that the Church was right," is very impressive.

If the clergy do write, what shall their books be? Sermons? There are printed volumes of sermons about which the reader feels that a very large share of their original value must have been owed to the actual voice and presence of the preacher. And there are volumes which are a part of the literature of the language in which they are written. But the book-form is different from the sermon-form. While it is probable that the ideas of most clerical writers, even Archbishops and Bishops who deliver Gifford Lectures, have been tried out in the pulpit, it is certain that many theological books suffer from never having been perfectly emancipated from an original homiletic pattern. The task of re-writing a sermon into a chapter of a book is, *experto crede*, very difficult and very unlikely to be satisfactory. No one now dreams of appealing to the Gentle Reader, but sometimes the bygone necessity of appealing to Gentle Hearers will still contaminate the printed page.

Supposing that the books are not actual sermons, or, if they ever were, have purged themselves completely from that vitiating form, what shall they be? A recent volume, *The Religious Crisis*, by Mr. Roger Lloyd (Lovat Dickson, 5s.), is a good example of a book which could only have been written by a young Anglican priest. Mr. Lloyd has made a careful study of the Humanists, Lipmann, the Huxleys, the Powyses, Bertrand Russell, Joad. He knows the difference between them. He has made much greater and more sympathetic efforts to understand what they have to teach than they have ever made to understand, say, von Hügel or A. E. Taylor. He is not strong in theology or criticism, but he has a grip of ideas. Through all his study of these writers he has felt that Christianity—by which he does really mean the religion of Christ, Christ

Incarnate, Christ Crucified, Christ Risen, and nothing else—is the only answer to those perplexities which he himself, a citizen of the modern world, feels as much as anybody. And the sphere in which he finds that this vital religion operates most freely and most promisingly is the Church of England. One very competent judge of books glanced at the outside of this one and said, "I don't want books like that. I can make up my own mind. I want facts." There are experienced readers who already know most of what is in this book. But many do not. The book expresses the pain felt by a generous nature for the sad condition of the world, and an abundant hopefulness.

Another book, of quite different kind, which could only have come out of a Vicarage is Mr. J. H. Evans' study of George Crabbe (Sheldon Press, 7s. 6d.). Mr. Evans is Vicar of Croxton Kerrial, Crabbe's parish in Rutlandshire. With pious care he tells the story of the poet's life, often in the poet's own verse. Crabbe owed not a little to influential patrons, Edmund Burke, Lord Thurlow, the Duke of Rutland, and such a lady as she of whom it is written that—

She holds, as she believes, her wealth in trust,
And being kind with her is being just.

At Church attendance she requires of all
Who would be held in credit at the Hall.

but he deserved this. He was a devout Christian and a faithful shepherd of souls. It was not a very exalted type of piety—

Light were their troubles and their wishes few,
Thrift made them easy for the coming day,
Religion took the dread of death away—

but it governed his life. Not long before he died he wrote "The Sacrament"—

O sacred gift of God to man,
A faith that looks above,
And sees the deep, amazing plan
Of sanctifying love.

I know Thou didst ordain for me,
Thy creature, bread and wine;
The depth of grace I cannot see,
But worship the design.

Mr. Evans has used local history, parochial and family manuscripts, and above all Crabbe's own works. The result is a very pleasing book.

There is one clerical book that needs to be written. It will have to be a symposium (horrid word!). It will deal with the difference that post-war conditions have made to parish work. In bare essentials (and how few they are!) it will be faithful to Catholic tradition, but it will constantly startle readers by its boldness. And yet the suggestions will never be doctrinaire; they will all have been born of some actual experience. There will be chapters on the theological needs of the period, Evangelism, home work for Overseas Missions, the new outlook in the matter of Reunion, the work of trained women, Prayer Book Revision, Ceremonial, Music, Visiting, Clerical and Lay Preaching, the place of Clubs, Scouts, C.L.B., Guides, etc., Teaching Methods, Sunday Observance, Marriage and the Home, Leisure, Recruiting for the Ministry and the Religious Life, Parochial, Diocesan and Central Finance, the relation of Church and State, City Churches, New Areas, and perhaps some other topics. None of the chapters will come "out of the old box." All the writers, to parody a famous piece of bombast, will be the elephants of Catholicism, carrying the artillery of Christianity over the mountains of difficulty through parishes which might well appal the apostles and prophets of the New Testament. *πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἱκανός;*

We are about to inaugurate a development in connection with THEOLOGY, not actually within its pages, but alongside them. The proposal is to have a series of THEOLOGY OCCASIONAL PAPERS. A newly appointed Professor gives his Inaugural Lecture. It is printed; he sends copies to his friends; a few others buy it. But it cannot be largely advertised, and very soon it ceases to be practically available. At other times a competent writer is moved to produce something which is too long for a magazine article and not long enough for a book. There is no convenient means of publication. We think that there is room for this proposed series, to be advertised regularly in THEOLOGY, and to be sold for about 1s. each. It is not a money-making proposal, but we believe that it will be useful and will just pay its way.

CORPUS CHRISTI

The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread : and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat : this is my body which is broken for you.—1 Corinthians xi. 24.

Now ye are the body of Christ.—1 Corinthians xii. 27.

We are one body in Christ.—Romans xii. 5.

The church which is his body.—Ephesians i. 22, 23.

We are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.—Ephesians v. 30.

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.—St. Matthew xxv. 40.

A Lamb, standing as it had been slain.—Revelation v. 6.

MAN'S purpose in this world is the adoration of God. We are in this world to get out of it. It is our duty, and should be our desire, to find everywhere evidence of the being of God, and to help others into the enjoyment and fulfilment of the same task. We may deceive ourselves; we may try and evade this great business of our lives. We may prefer to make a god rather than to discover God. We may believe we can forget God. We may, either through carelessness or intent, neglect Him; but we shall never have any real happiness in anything until we admit that we were made for Him, and that there is no comfort nor consolation in anything save in this search for and this realization of God. While all our activities are, rightly considered, a part of that search and of that discovery, there is a specific activity which is man's most direct and definite endeavour to be at one with God, to give Him that which is His due, to receive from Him that which we need for our spiritual sustenance. That is what we call the worship or the adoration of God, the specific service given to God. The manner of our worship will obviously be conditioned by our views of God's being. Throughout the world's history men have had different ideas about God, and their worship has illustrated those differences. Gods brutal, gods indifferent, gods jealous with a human jealousy, gods with violent national pride, gods who are merely natural forces, gods who are shadows of human fears or human hopes, gods who are mechanisms for satisfying private needs, bound to work on the repetition of the right formula, gods who are creatures of their universe, and gods who are only the capricious dream of some unknown, half-acknowledged veiled power, itself infinitely remote, infinitely heedless, and which will one day involve all men and all gods in the blank night of an eternal Ragnarok. The worship given to these gods has been as varied as the conceptions of the divinity adored—ranging

from the bloody sacrifices of children before the glowing image of Moloch to the year-long trance of an Indian yogi contemplating the eternal dream of Brahma. Most of these gods are still worshipped, and often by those who profess different faiths: and before we are too hasty to condemn all or any of them we would do well to search our own naughty imaginations and see whether there are not corners, hidden and shameful, to which we retire occasionally to offer a pinch of incense to the more convenient gods of paganism.

But we have our revelation. However much we may differ on other points, all Christians are united in the acknowledgement that Christ is God. Most of us do not understand that tremendous statement—comparatively few Christians have a correct apprehension of the theological dogmas by which that truth has been supported and, in so far as is possible, explained. Nor is it necessary that a man should have this correct apprehension. It is enough if, as George Tyrrell writes, "the whole practical attitude of the will and affections towards Christ is that which befits the creature in relation to the Creator—an attitude of latria, of absolute worship, submission and devotion such as is due to God alone." That the simplest Christian can and will give. He cannot do more and he dare not do less. He belongs to that order which has received God's priceless benefit—a revelation of Himself which enables man, without peril of idolatry, to apprehend through the emotions and affections, as well as through the reason and the spirit, a revelation which shews man the way to God because God became man, a revelation which has blazed for ever a clear road from things temporal to things eternal, since God Himself left the kingdom of eternity to sojourn in and sanctify the empty passages of precarious time. Christianity, which has often been rashly compared with previous religions, is, really, in this truth of the Incarnation, the greatest contrast to them. Other faiths have told of babies becoming gods: our faith puts God in the cradle. Other faiths have shewn heroes, after a life of service, mounting as a reward to the heavens: our faith brings God out of His heaven to eat and drink and be merry, to mourn and to work with us. Other faiths have had martyrs, and noble ones, and crowned them with triumph in glory: our faith tells of God leaving His eternal throne, of God rejected by men and crucified with malefactors on the Rood of Calvary, which is the Rood of Time.

It is plain that this faith, so unique, so dangerous, so contrary to human expectations and such a solace to human despair, will justify, will demand, a worship of its own. As the purpose of religion is to adore God, so the object of worship is to make the approach to God easy for His children. I do not mean that

worship should be superficially facile, should entail no work for the worshipper, no energy—but that the energy expended should be as little as possible misdirected. Worship is the normal man's normal effort to realize the eternal values. Now it is obvious that the whole relation between time and eternity has been divinely upset by the Incarnation. The Incarnation is the proof of the fact that the world of time can be interpenetrated by the world of reality; but it is also a proof that God desires that we should approach Him by means of those things which are apprehended by the senses. We are to have a spiritual apprehension of the sensuous: and at the same time recognize that for most of us the sensuous is the normal channel by which things of the Spirit come to us. Since God lay in Mary's bosom, since God pushed the plane at Joseph's bench in Nazareth, since God ate and drank with Pharisee and publican, since God took to Himself friends and companions on earth, since God submitted to men's law and to the final destiny of the tomb . . . the whole world of time and space is infinitely changed. I do not mean that before the Incarnation the universe had not a sacramental character for those few who could apprehend it, as many of the Hebrew prophets and as Plato apprehended it: but that now we have no excuse for failing in apprehension. Before the birth in Bethlehem a few men here and there could see the hem of the robe of God in the beauty and the power of nature: but for us the earth and the sea are sacred because He walked upon them, and the air is divine because one dark day, on a hill outside a petty Asiatic city, God's Body was hanged for man's mocking, for man's pity and for man's salvation upon the gallows of Imperial Rome.

God's Body. *Corpus Christi*. Here, if we can appreciate it, we have the secret, the great heart of Christian worship. Worship is an act of brotherhood and an admission of filial duty: it is the response of the children of God to the Spirit of God, and it is a response which can be made, is made, in many ways. Our God is the God who praised the lilies, who told us that the sparrows are not too trivial for His care; He is that God who found beauty in the pearl-white teeth of the dead dog; he is the God of nature. He is not confined or enclosed in nature nor in the whole vast universe, as the pantheists have argued: but nature is His garment, and no man can investigate natural phenomena without getting nearer to God. So if we are unhappy, as we often must be, at the scepticism, the apparent irreligion of the men of science, we must remember that no man can approach truth without approaching God, and that the scientist's intellectual difficulties or stupidities may only be the wounds which he suffers in the fight for truth. For God is truth.

As God is in nature, so is He in art. The poet, the painter, the musician, the sculptor, the architect can only approach perfection in their different vocations by approaching God; and if we are grieved, as well we may be, at the moral lapses and mischances of artists, we would do well to consider how much of their troubles may not be our fault, whether their delinquency be not our delinquency. For religious people too often forget that you cannot touch beauty without touching God, nor reveal beauty without revealing God. For God is beauty.

And in our especial and particular sense Christ's Body is the Church, and the whole company, whether in heaven, in purgatory or on earth, of those for whom He died: all who admit the claims of the household of faith. If you ask me what I mean by the Church, how I would limit it, I would reply that the Church can only be limited by the true passionate love of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and that if we can think of anyone outside the reach of the flame of that love we may regard him as outside the soul of the Church. It is better, surely, to examine the quality of our own churchmanship rather than the credentials of other people's, and to try and deepen our own faith without narrowing our charity. "We are one body in Christ." It is a dreadful responsibility; how dreadful Jesus Himself reminds us in the great parable of the Last Judgement. We can cheer ourselves, in our moments of despondency and self-disgust, with this assurance—that those of us who abhor the spirit of schism, who try and cling to the brotherhood, who admit the civic burden of the royal city of Christ, witness in our inadequate way to the final truth we have learned about God. For we witness to brotherhood: and brotherhood is love: and God is love.

Corpus Christi. I now wish to consider the implications of the Incarnation in the direction of Christian public worship. The whole world became sacramental: and some might have thought—some indeed have thought—that this excused men from any specific acts of worship. If God can be found in the cleaving of the wood and the lifting of the stone, in feeding the hungry and visiting the prisoner: if God is present in the search of the man of science, in the labours of the artist, in the dear atmosphere of the family and the happiness of friendship, why try to bind men to any specific services, to any particular acknowledgement of the divine presence? It is an odd objection. If a man devotedly and wholeheartedly love his wife, he will scarcely be satisfied—and she certainly will not—with a general admission of this truth. He will want to tell her—and she will love to hear. Things unsaid tend to become things unrealized:

because beauty is everywhere, few men will give up seeking it in special objects. No one, indeed, in the ordinary life of every day behaves as some men would have us behave in the business of God. Nor, indeed, are we left with a choice. Jesus especially left us two definite acts by which we were to remember our service to, and our love of, God—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. By Baptism we become members of His Body: and in the Lord's Supper we partake of His body and His blood. The delight of these duties, the burden of these privileges, we have explicitly left to us. By implication we have much more. We, the Church of Christ, are left with what I may perhaps call those two hints and the great command to preach the gospel. We are left, that is, with the two great sacraments and the duty of preaching Him who gave them to us.

Now I would contend that it was not only natural, it was following our Lord's expressed desire, when the Church almost immediately began to encourage a "focus" of Christian worship. The pattern of all Catholic liturgies is to be found in the book of the Apocalypse. There, in the description of the adoration of the Lamb, standing as it had been slain between the throne and the elders, you have St. John's parable of the Apostolic Mass. The worship is in heaven. All Christian worship takes place in heaven. That is, it takes place in eternity. We have no longer a local Christ, a Jesus confined to the conditions of time and space. When we eat His flesh and drink His blood, it is at a heavenly banquet in eternity that we are assisting. It was expedient for us that He should go away; because if He had stayed here on earth we should have found it impossible to realize the trivial impertinences of time, the glorious certainty and safety of the things that are eternal. He left earth to take us to heaven: He had inhabited our country, in order to take His brothers to His own country and God's. For when we pray "Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven" we pray that heaven may descend to earth, and earth become as heaven. When once we grasp that all worship is in eternity, controversy about idolatry becomes meaningless. "Love God," said St. Austin, "and do what you will"—and we may twist that saying into "Believe in God, and worship what you will"—for you cannot worship anything in eternity without worshipping God: for that which has eternal virtue comes from God and goes back to Him.

The Christians of the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages lived very near a daily realization of eternity, and they had no fear of localizing God, because God turned all places out of space into eternity. This is none other than the house of God, this is the gate of heaven, is true of the whole world. The earliest

focus of worship was an altar—and the altar was nearly always a tomb. The tomb of a martyr was a Christian's last act in time . . . the last step from which he had run into the perpetual enjoyment of that eternal life of which he had had snatches while on earth. Any tomb was also a place of prayer; and the relics of those who died for Christ were revered as men reverence any memorial of a friend faithful to death. As early as the time of Tertullian the Cross was an object of worship, at any rate in private devotions; and we know from the so-called *Peregrinatio Silviæ* that by the fourth century the adoration of the Cross of Good Friday was part of the public service of the Church in Jerusalem. By the time of the second Œcumenical Council of Nicæa (787) the Church had accepted the worship of images. Another focus of worship from early times was the Book of the Gospels. The principle of such aids to concentration was very early admitted in the Church; but the use of the Blessed Sacrament for purposes of devotion is, so far as our evidence goes, not earlier than the eleventh century.

I have no intention here of entering into the controversies about the truth or the manner of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar. Few unprejudiced persons will, I think, object if I take for granted that the ordinary Christian believed that Christ was present with the elements, and worshipped him so present during the service of Holy Communion, especially before making his own communion; it seems to me doubtful whether Berengarius, who died in 1088 and is usually regarded as the first theologian to propound "a sacramentarian" view of our Lord's presence, was really a heretic, and not simply the victim of that over-subtlety which is the curse of scholastic theology up to the time of Wyclif, of Calvin or beyond. It is, however, certain that Berengarius was responsible for the rise of what is called the cultus of the Blessed Sacrament. Less than thirty years after his death is held the Lateran Council which decrees transubstantiation, and by the middle of the thirteenth century the festival of Corpus Christi has been started in the diocese of Liège, and, at the bidding of Urban IV., St. Thomas Aquinas has written the office which is still in use for that feast, and those superb hymns which are, with Newman's, noteworthy for their carefulness of theological statement and their passionate intensity of spiritual devotion.

"No creature ought to hold us back on our way to God, since not even our Lord Himself, in so far as He vouchsafed to be our Way, wills to hold us back, but went away from us, lest we should in our weakness cleave to those things in time which He suffered and did for our salvation, instead of by means of them running more keenly onwards." So wrote St. Augustine in

his treatise on Christian doctrine; and the sentence contains the principle which should govern all Christian lives. It is really the principle of Jesus, who recommends or allows the loss of our senses, nay, the loss of manhood itself, if the senses or our virility should be an obstacle to the attainment of the kingdom. It is obvious, however, that those called to the life of the anchorite, of the pillar-saint, those who are eunuchs for the gospel's sake, will always be few, will not be those for whom the Church at large has to provide. It would not be reasonable to do more—it would be treachery to do less—than honour such champions of the Cross, and do nothing to impede their lonely progress along a path which must always be the solitary climb of a soul in communion with God. For most of us, exterior means of grace are necessary and welcome, so long as these means do not interfere with the prerogative of God and can be shewn by Christian experience to be helps rather than hindrances. God alone is to be worshipped—but in His mercy and wisdom the means by which we are encouraged to worship are as various as our needs and as wide as His incomprehensible bounty.

Is the cultus of the Blessed Sacrament such a means? Before we consider that, and its possible development in the Church of England, some objections to it must be met. It is late. It is only known in Latin Christendom. It is associated with a particular theory of the mode of the divine presence.

1. I cannot understand anyone—especially an English churchman—protesting against a devotion because it is not of great antiquity. Do we respect everything which is of great antiquity? Have we no novelties in our church order or church services? A Church which had almost abandoned the official use of prayer for the dead, and entirely abandoned the invocation of saints; a Church which shews little official reverence for relics, which destroyed the shrines of the saints; a Church which has permitted what was entirely unknown for more than a thousand years, the marriage of persons in holy orders; a Church which for centuries discouraged altogether the religious life for men and women, one of the oldest and most revered marks of the Christian life—surely that Church has no right to dismiss a particular observance because it is only nine hundred years old.

2. Nor again can I see any force in the argument that devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and the extra-liturgical cultus are purely Western customs. The Church of England is a purely Western Church.

3. As for the association of the cultus with the doctrine of transubstantiation—this has been exaggerated. It would be fair to say that the same emergency gave rise to the cultus

and led the Lateran Council to the definition; but the two are in no way interdependent. Indeed, with the rise of modern theories of matter—with the virtual disappearance of matter from the textbooks of the scientists, the definition of transubstantiation has become little more than a philosophic survival, only of acute interest to students of medieval philosophy.

So I would ask all English churchmen to consider the question of devotion to the Sacrament of the Altar, freeing themselves as far as they can from any particular anti-Roman bias. The great object of the Reformation in public worship was to turn the Mass into a communion; the great result of the Reformation was that the Romans succeeded in doing this, and that we failed. That is, the Roman Catholics succeeded, after great difficulties, in getting their people once more to frequent the altar of God, not merely to hear Mass, but to make their communions frequently; in the Church of England—except during such sporadic revivals as the Laudian and that under Queen Anne—communions were still distressingly infrequent and very few heard more than half a Mass. It may be that this was a desirable result—there are those who apparently wish to maintain it, but it certainly was not in accord with apostolic or sub-apostolic practice.

Now it is at least arguable that the more frequent communions in the Roman Obedience, and the more general sense of the supernatural (no one who knows Roman Catholics can deny this latter quality), is due to the worship of Jesus in the tabernacle, and to the popularity of such services as Exposition and Benediction. It is also worth noticing that this development of the emotional side of public worship has not coincided with any decline in the power of the pulpit, or in the readiness of the people to listen to sermons. Nor do I think you can argue that the cultus of the Blessed Sacrament has impaired that sense of the supremacy of God which is the root of all religion. People who casually visit the Continent come back and say that Roman Catholics only worship Jesus in the Sacrament, and our Blessed Lady and a favourite saint or two: they forget that, even if this is true of some (whose brethren in England probably never darken a church door except at the Harvest Festival), they are so instructed in elementary Christian doctrine that they know they cannot adore Jesus in the host, or worship Mary and the saints without paying their duty to Almighty God.

So we come back to the peril of idolatry. I would ask all who make this accusation, and make it, I hope, in love and with a desire to be helpful, to consider what they mean. Do they really believe that anyone to-day is in danger of confusing

the presence of God with the means by which He gives His presence? There is to-day, as there has not been for ages, a peril of idolatry. The worship of comfort, the worship of pleasure, the worship of popular opinion, the worship of sport, the worship of riches . . . all these are serious rivals to the adoration which we owe to God: cannot those of us who desire to recall the world away from these false allegiances unite together and agree not to hinder those who find strength for the conflict in their devotion to their Lord in the adorable Sacrament of His love, even though that devotion be expressed in a way for which nothing can be said except that it has helped millions of simple Christians since the days when St. Thomas wrote his *Adoro te devote, latens deitas*.

R. ELLIS ROBERTS.

PRAYER WITHOUT THEISM

I

Is it possible or profitable to pray, in any real sense of the word, in the absence of belief in a "personal God"? Many theists without hesitation will give a negative answer, if they even contemplate that the question can be asked. That negative answer is tragically echoed in young minds enmeshed in their first intellectual doubts, and the pain of bewilderment is redoubled by the apprehension that henceforth for honesty's sake they must stifle their impulse towards prayer. With less poignant feeling but with no less real result, the negative answer is apt to be assumed by the man who has settled down into that absence of belief. Is a negative answer unavoidable?

Theists who give that answer are thinking in no unworthy way. They are not urging merely (or probably at all) that in parting with theism and losing prayer we lose a means of obtaining material benefits, but that we lose the heart of the religious life. To avoid any misleading associations let us sometimes use the word "orison" instead of prayer. Religious experience in the full sense will be orison fulfilling itself in action, step by step; inward communion passing into that service which itself is a further communion. The second stage is usually not questioned; it is admitted that a non-theist may serve such good as he sees. The question is, In what sense can he have the first stage? Is he doomed, if he is logical and sincere, to go forward into service with that straining of small

muscles and shallowness of breath which comes from taking no time for an inward life? Or if he does take time for it, what may we suppose will happen therein?

The theoretical difficulty seems chiefly to concern the earliest steps in orison, those of vocal prayer. Postponing consideration of these, let us look first at the level usually accounted the highest. Is mystical experience possible for the non-theist? We must distinguish two questions which are sometimes confused: (a) Would such experience be possible if no personal God existed? And (b) Can it occur where no personal God is believed in? The first question is fair matter of debate between theist and non-theist, but does not concern us here. The second question is our concern. Can the theist, at any rate, dare to answer it with a mere denial? May not the uncovenanted mercies of his God descend one day upon the blindest of sincere human beings? "I will gird thee, though thou hast not known Me." The non-theist would have to find his own explanation, but the theist cannot rule out the possibility of the event happening.

On the middle levels, anyone who is moved by the sight or thought of good should be able to know meditation and affective orison, and the "blind blunt heaving up of the heart." But the middle levels are shot through by a form of address which becomes most prominent in the simple and explicit shape of vocal prayer, and it is here chiefly that the difficulty confronts us. Whom or what (the theist is entitled to ask) can the non-theist deem that he is addressing? And is it all mere rhetoric—the working-up or the overflow of emotion—or is he expecting to be heard? What can his words mean? The questions are not merely those of an antagonist, for, as I indicated at the beginning, they have their most tragic and heartfelt place within the mind of the young. If there is any fair answer, however complex, it is important to seek it.

As the first step in that search, I would note one fact. No Church or generation, in using great traditional forms or phrases of prayer, is accustomed to bind itself too closely to literal meanings. The words are felt to be our servants, fit to be compelled to convey a sense which we need not fear that God will misunderstand. One of the frankest examples is enclosed in the Bidding Prayer of the ancient universities. "These prayers and praises let us offer up in the words which Christ Himself has taught us"; and so we close with the "Our Father . . ." In silent orison, the words need not dominate even a so-called vocal prayer. They are constantly subsidiary

* Abbot Cuthbert Butler, and other Catholic theologians whom he quotes, make no such denial. See *Western Mysticism*, second edition (1927), Appendix.

to other images—for instance, to mental gesture. “Out of the deep have I cried unto Thee.” The words do not dictate the gesture; they follow upon it. The intent is conveyed by the kinæsthetic image before it passes into words.

The second step in the search is a longer one, but it brings us to the position from which alone we can see the truth. The heart and structure of all veritable orison, theistic or non-theistic, is the *intent towards*. And the heart of that intent is not asking, but offering.

So far as one can find analogies for the experience, effective prayer is like the gathering and soaring of a flame; small and feeble at first, choked by damp and beaten about by winds, and then, gradually and fitfully but increasingly, taking hold on more and more of the fuel in us and burning more and more strongly, till it stretches straight up towards heaven. Or it is as if the leader of a half-disorderly band of free-lances came to offer himself and his company to the army of his choice, and as if, one by one, and then in twos and threes and dozens, wresting themselves free from indecision and reluctance and rebellion under the compulsion of his leadership, his companions fell in behind him until all were there.

But what is this upstretching and offering, it may be asked, if heaven is out of reach and void, and if the army of our choice has no headquarters and no general? Even in the metaphor, I reply, does this invalidate the act? The fuel turns to light and heat; and we join ourselves to the army wherever we find it. Though many questions of detail may puzzle us, yet we have as much clearness as we need for orison; about that Good to which we offer and present ourselves, our souls and bodies. Effective prayer is the completeness of a fundamental act of will. Or if, strictly speaking, that act is not completed except by its fulfilment in practical life, then prayer is the completeness of the first stage. We have straightened out the tangle of our mind and heart, not by turning round to handle it, but by reaching out beyond us. Prayer is a gradual drawing together and drawing out and smoothing; it is a concentration of powers, a full desire. And yet it is already more than that, for to present ourselves is to be possessed. Within this range the Kingdom has come.

This all-important doubleness must be held fast by theist and non-theist alike. The Good to which we join ourselves, towards which we bow down, has its clearest kind of embodiment in that worshipping will which we bring to it or which brings us. With the eyes of what is immanent we look towards the transcendent.

I cannot feel that the charge of “self-worship” which is sometimes brought has any application here at all. The different charge of “worshipping what does not exist” is more puzzling.

I think all dedication, secular or religious, must involve reference to something which does not yet *sufficiently* exist in the space-and-time world; something which in part is there, but which yet we invoke to take further possession and to grow.* This is the very purpose for which, or in which, we offer ourselves. Such reference must be common to theist and non-theist; but beyond this I think the charge does bring out a real difference. I would only hold fast to the importance of the existent which, within them and without them, all worshippers know.

II

In the foregoing I have concentrated on simple prayer at its point of completion—the position that we reach, at our happiest, before the end. But the way to this may be a long one, and it may be useful here to offer an analysis of a particular worked-out prayer.

“As head of a corporate body,” writes the experient:

“I had formed a strong desire that a vacant post should be filled by a particular man; but I had increasing reason to believe that most of the members of the appointing committee were not going to be persuaded to share my view. As conversations went on and the time of decision approached I found that I was becoming inwardly hot and excited and bitter; that my mind was closing on this object of desire in a cramp-like grip which (I still had enough reasonableness left to know) was going to shut out all reference to a context which the shut-in part of me would yet wish to remember. I finally said to myself, or rather the situation seemed suddenly to say to me, ‘This won’t do.’ So I tried to put my mind into a position which would make some working-out possible—to orientate it, as it were, along the line of that larger desire which still survived in the depths of me. The object of that desire was misty and complicated, but its direction (if I may distinguish) was distinct enough. With a considerable effort I pinned myself along that line.

“I then began to argue with myself; but it was only for a minute or two that this description would fit the case. After that I seemed rather to have made room for an intent conversation carried on by a number of participants. Perhaps they represented bits of me, but they seemed to stand more naturally for angles or aspects of the situation, or for successive reaches and distances within it; they were voices speaking from these through me or to me. The conversation was carried on partly in words, partly in other images; it seemed to be largely a kind of exhibiting, the *facts* pushing forward in turn from this quarter and from that.† My metaphors seem mixed enough, but conversation is still the best term I

* “Till through the depth of years that yearn
The face of the Republic burn.”

† Cf. some familiar expressions: “The unfinished work reproached him.” “The difficulty challenged him.” “The child’s innocence rebuked him.”—H. W.

can find, with the addition that this conversation was definitely and rather rapidly getting somewhere.

"I could translate and set down its successive points in some such way as follows: (1) The committee members have been sent there to use their own best judgment and conscience; I must not wish to override these. Even if by sheer force I could gain my immediate end, the machinery of co-operation and government would be harmed. There would probably be reaction and resistance next time: anyhow, in some way our tone would be worse.' (2) 'I must be inwardly friendly. Cramp gives rise automatically to an opposing cramp, but if I can purify my will from wilfulness it should help others to do the same. If I can put my mind honestly alongside of theirs, and enter into their views as well as my own, the permanent working should be bettered, even if a mistake is made this time.' (3) 'I must not rebel against this hold-up; this demand for thought and patience. It is a proper part of the year's demands, and good should come from responding to it.' (4) 'As to the appointment, I do desire that the total of appointments and non-appointments should be disposed as is best on the whole; that, even if my man is best for this post, he should work elsewhere, if that total disposition is best. Not "let the best man win" (itself a fine traditional correction of cramp), but "let the best arrangement win." This is part of what I mean if I say, "Thy will be done."' (5) 'But there is a further and distinct range of meaning. If the best arrangement doesn't win—if a mistake is finally made—Your will shall be done about that result. We will co-operate in making the best of it. I must be friendly, for instance, towards the person appointed and help him; the situation could be hard on him.' (6) 'And this extends into the call of moral chivalry in general: towards the unwanted person; towards the unwanted event. It isn't their fault. If a wrong has happened to the world, it is hard on the world—help it through.' (7) 'All this my heart wills, if it can come to the knowledge of what it wills.'

"This takes much longer to write out than it took to happen, and the words may be misunderstood. 'I must,' for instance, was not merely recognition of an obligation or moral demand; it was assent and consent, given at first by a part of me which gradually drew in more and more of me. Such words as were used at the time were handholds in climbing, or they were flecks of foam on the stream. The stream itself, which bore up the conversation and bore it along, was the widening and deepening current of will, set towards the compass-point 'such things as be rightful.'

"You might say the only immediate result or aim was the production in myself of a proper state of mind, but the experience was not that of looking at myself and doing things to myself. I looked at a whole situation of which I was a small part, and tried to get into tune for the resolution of its discords. Or, still more nearly, I stood in the situation and looked out from it with obscure vision and weak will, but a definite direction. The happenings that followed might well be described as 'The Lord said . . .'. A speech was made in many voices, in me and to me and through me. But if I were required to explain 'the Lord,' I should have to try to make it clear that I did not mean a separate person additional to me and to the situation, pointing out truths and inviting towards good. Truth and good, and the craving after truth and good, were somehow speaking for themselves."

III

In "vocal" orison, such as the above, it is obvious that the words must be servants and not masters. The earlier stages particularly may be shaped almost by accident. The experient might find himself using gestures and visual images and no words at all, from the moment of that first flight from evil which came with the realization "This won't do." He will be unwise if he holds himself up by criticism of the forms which come ready to hand. I emphasize this because I believe that the ideas of coldness, dryness, and triteness, which theists often connect with the thought of non-theistic prayer, come partly from mistaken views about the extent to which practice must be controlled by our attempts at theory. Whatever it is that is happening in prayer, it is something much too complex to be profitably governed by a tight and critical conscious control. We must let the spirit work, and let it use such words and pictures as it can get hold of, while improving the supply if we can as time goes on. The business of interpretation comes in the intervals.

I suspect this misapprehension of contributing something to the warmth with which Friedrich Heiler, for instance, attacks apparently most of men's attempts to straighten out their thoughts.* "The philosophical ideal of prayer . . . can produce only dissolving and destroying effects. But so little as rites and incantations could stifle simple prayer, so little can philosophical criticism kill it." "Whenever prayer is transferred to the inner moral disposition, real prayer, which is the turning of the soul to God, the supplication for divine power, and the utterance of a resigned spirit, becomes nothing but a mere expedient of ethical training. Prayer is thus stripped of its religious character, robbed of its independent value. The 'spirit of prayer' ceases to be prayer and becomes a mere moral substitute." Whilst deprecating Heiler's attack, we can sympathize with his defence. Real prayer truly in some sense includes what Heiler says it is. The attempt to define that sense must wait upon the rich process itself, not sterilize it. But in the long example I have given, have we not the utterance of a spirit that achieves resignation, and the turning towards God under His aspect as the substance of all good? Further, we may entirely agree that prayer has its independent value. It is no mere means or expedient towards the attainment of a final moral state. The value (not merely a moral value) lies

* *Prayer*, by F. Heiler, tr. McComb, chapter on "Prayer in Philosophical Thought," especially pp. 95, 103.

all along the process, which, as we said, is not only a means but a part of the coming of the Kingdom. The analysis of vocal prayer may tend to throw too much stress upon the end. What in vocal prayer is spread out as an act of will comes to its own in unity in the more advanced states as an act of love, or of life.

Heiler's remaining requirement is the supplication for divine power. Let us consider this. What is this power that with suppliant phrases we seek, and receive?

Its accession seems to be conditioned, first, by the attitude which in praying we attain. We attain to standing straight in spirit, and relaxing our tense conflicting muscles, and letting the air fill our lungs. We attain to dropping irrelevant resistances and our worries about self-protection, knowing how small a thing is our given self in comparison with that which we are seeking to serve or to fulfil. With each advance in the attainment, the effective and available power does grow. "Is this an increase of our own strength, or an access of strength from outside us?" I doubt whether the question has a clear meaning; and the difficulty of answering it, in this important situation, brings out the doubtful nature of the private-possession map in a wider field. "Mine" and "from outside me" might seem an easy contrast in bodily affairs, if I identify myself with an organism bounded in space. Yet whence did its very materials come if not from outside, and its eating and breathing every day still set the boundary at defiance? The interaction of mind with its world has less formality than this. When I fall in love, is the energy and the leaping flame a part of me, or of Nature, or of Aphrodite? Do I possess it, or does it possess me? When the vision of Good, or the horror of evil, blows the Good Will into flame in me, it seems to be myself rather than mine. I have been made into something that I was not, and had not.

While prayer is on the vocal level and in the stage of moving towards completion, the stress may be almost all on that which I am not and have not yet. It may be the quiet stress on the breath which is entering; or the desperate stress of grappling to my soul with hooks of steel all that which I would serve and be friends with. Yet, though the stress falls outside, it is possible only because the Good Will in part is inside. And the outcome is that I am to dwell in this and this in me, and that its work, in me and through me, should be done.

The natural expression of this process, and the means by which will and thought help themselves to continue, consists in words of supplication, just as what "the Lord said" falls into words of statement or command, and both are in our mother-tongue. We have learned forms of speech in converse with

other persons, but are able now to use them and be helped by them in the absence of that condition. It is not a degeneration or irrelevant survival of the use of language, but rather a setting free. Even in secular activities we may find that our intercourse with our world is rendering itself in an interchange of rudimentary petition and command. An artist at work on a terra-cotta figure described to me the pausing before a next step as "more like listening than anything else."* And the life of religion, which is the large-scale and long-range of all our secular activities, brings the rudimentary into articulate-ness. In the course of the orison the words will change as the attitude changes or fulfils itself. What began as the supplication for power reveals itself as identical with the under-side of dedication. "Give me strength" is the alternating form of "Take me, and use." "Take, for I cannot give." Here, once more, the essence is not an asking, but an offering. The strength enters with the progressive change of attitude, in which the entreaty expresses one recurrent phase.

What happens in prayer is infinitely complex in details, however simple in spirit. If we say that a prayer is a complete act of will (or complete first stage of this), we must envisage an act of will as one of multiplex interaction. Tightening the muscles and holding the breath may be an initial or a transitory incident, but the process as a whole is the very opposite.† In the process as a whole we throw the frontier wide open and work across it; we open the way to communication with all of the world that will co-operate with us; we put ourselves into a position to be helped. To give full way to our intent towards an object is to give that object more hold upon us and more power over us—power to draw and lift and keep; and by the same act we open the way for every co-operating force to work on us and in us. All those powers will work as certainly as the force of gravitation, and will belong, as gravitation belongs, to no atom by itself, but to the involutions of a universe. If we try to modernize our thought on gravitation, we may say that, certain relations being established, certain positions therewith become impossible and a new position is imposed. We have altered the world we live in, and it swings us into a new place. God, as the Substance of Good, can lift us by becoming the object of our love, and by living as love within us, and by flowing as grace towards us and through us from every source in our own

* Cf. A. A. Cock's interesting paper on "Prayer," *Aristotelian Society's Proceedings*, May, 1924: "In æsthetic experience, and particularly in art construction, there is a prayer factor, culminating in absorption."

† When we follow William James in saying that the athletic attitude is inadequate for religion, our thought is probably correct about religion, but out of date as regards athletics.

nature and in the world around. God as Person, I take it, would be a further source of grace; the supreme mode of the object of love; a better friend than all those friends whose precious love upholds us. Yet I venture to claim that the essence of dedication and of worship, and the divine power that comes with these, can be present even without that belief.

"But the highest Good must be personal." I do not question it. It may well be that the greatest value, worthy to claim the greatest devotion, must consist in some form of personal life. But the use of a form of address does not involve that we talk nonsense unless a person hears and notes what we say. If the evidence of poetry is regarded as unconvincing, I will refer only to the fact that we may dedicate ourselves to the service of a helpless infant who understands nothing, and that with the attitude the access of strength comes. In this variant, our willed co-operation with the universe expresses itself less as entreaty for that strength than as invocation for the sake of blessing.

IV

"But what are you supposing that the prayer *does*? Is anything changed except yourself?" I do not know; yet to change even myself is to change the balance of the world. And we set no limits. If our praying can move a mountain it shall do so, even in advance of the living that completes the prayer. But the question of the range of effect of the first stage is puzzling for the theist and the non-theist alike. I do not claim that the difference of belief leaves that question unaffected, but I claim that it does not change the central structure and essential value of prayer.

Let us look in this connection at a passage from a writer too early lost—Charles A. Bennett. He is criticizing Feuerbach, with how much historical justice I do not know, but the passage is relevant here:

"'Prayer,' says Feuerbach, 'is the unrestrained expression of human desire, the articulate utterance of the deepest longings of a soul forgetful of anything that might impede or frustrate them. Prayer, that is, is purely exclamatory. This seems to me to omit what is essential. For I can distinguish between a sigh, let us say, and a prayer, and the difference is this, that prayer, whether as worship or petition, expects to be heard. It is directed to another intelligence. Cancel that external reference, and what you have left is not prayer. It is mere lyricism seeking and finding automatically its own relief.' . . .

'I can make nothing of the notion of the expression of loyalty or love for its own sake. That is mere animal behaviour. The essence of loyalty and love is the conviction that their tributes are accepted and valued by another being.'""*

The criticisms of Bennett and Heiler do something to balance each other. For the one, prayer must be distinguished from the merely lyric; for the other, from the merely moral. But the amendment that I would make to Bennett's words will be evident from what precedes. The difference between a sigh and a prayer is that the prayer *intends happenings*. It will complete itself in whatever practical steps may be called for, otherwise it has been abortive even on its most inward side. The purposive structure may be most obvious where the prayer is impeded and spread out; in the mystic experience it may be as hidden as the electric current in the electric charge. But the purest act of adoration is still an organic part of the intent of the worshipper's life; else it is not worship or prayer. The essence of these, and of loyalty and love (whether or not they are accepted and valued by another being), is that they express, or are, not only feeling but fealty.

V

To summarize: I have urged that a religious-minded person, who is unconvinced of the existence of a personal God, should not be regarded, or regard himself, as thereby cut off from that life of personal religion which is prayer. There is still left to him what I suggest is the central structure of prayer—the completeness (so far as it can be inwardly complete) of an act of worship, fealty, or will. Its solidity consists not in its being heard by a Listener (most precious as that may be to the believer), but in its forming an integral part of the worshipper's most full and serious life and of the world's life. The Good Will takes form in this man as an intent towards Good, as an inward keeping company with Good, and finally as the outward living following from this. Forms of speech learnt first in intercourse with human beings may be freely used to help the keeping company, not as a mere survival or an empty shell, but as instruments now of the most weighty intercourse of all. We may begin the conversation almost anywhere and let it develop. It may begin with an asking which (for theist as well as non-theist) raises difficulties of theory. But as it proceeds and discovers its own deeper intent it reveals itself as an offering.

* Charles A. Bennett, *The Dilemma of Religious Knowledge*, Yale University Press, 1931, p. 42.

Further, an act of will, even in small affairs, should not be thought of as a bracing of oneself in a strength supposed to be one's private possession, but rather as the dropping of irrelevant cares and the opening to, and uniting with, every available help, till what works through us may be summed up truly as "the strength of all them that put their trust in Thee."

And if it is asked, Does this complicated argument represent what you would say to a seventeen-year-old who has doubts about the Creed? I can only answer that I think I should try, tentatively, some selections from it; and that anyhow if I could I should offer some practical advice, in a letter, perhaps, rather than in speech.

"Go on with prayer, not in order that you may tamper with your reasoning, but for the strengthened and deepened contribution that it helps us to make to life, and for the strengthened and deepened life that prayer itself is. Behave exactly as if you were approaching 'a God,' and ask for help to serve. Do not be put off by the charge of 'auto-suggestion'; it means no more than self-prompting, and you are using self-prompting not as a means to self-deception, but as a means to learn. Look only briefly or indirectly at your present self and its difficulties; they need not be explained or described. Look directly towards that which you desire; reach out towards it; put yourself at its service with all the earnestness you have, and ask that more earnestness may be granted you. Use such words as come, but if you cease to want words you should cease to use them; let them give place to quiet. Then, not every day in clear surface consciousness, but in fact on deeper levels, I believe you will find that more and more of you slowly turns and falls in behind your deepest desire. Your powers and impulses, so scattered and confused, will be drawn in and concentrated into an increasingly complete act of will, and finally into an act of living in which even will lies at rest. Your spiritual muscles will cease to strain at random against one another; they will relax and come into accord, and your inward breathing, from short and shallow, will become more leisurely and deep, as your self little by little takes up its right and simple attitude towards the universe. If the happenings are all blended with bodily adjustments and bodily sensations, again do not be disturbed. Why should not bodily experience help as well as hinder? *But let all this look after itself.* Do not turn round on yourself to ascertain whether it is happening. Spend the time of prayer in looking out and reaching out; in turning towards that to which you would belong and which you would serve; turning from evil to find a better thing. Then go straight on from this attitude into outward life. The act of will, which

you have taken time to make as complete as you can, must now receive a new completeness in outward action.

"And all this, not in order that by secret means you may convey yourself back to Jerusalem (that must look after itself), but that you may find and know the sanctuary in the countries whither you shall come, and have the freedom of it, to go out and to come in."

HELEN WODEHOUSE.

A CATHOLIC YOUTH MOVEMENT

WHEN grouped in that phrase each of those three words has a certain significance, and it may be helpful if we consider each significance in turn, working backwards.

It is an essential of any movement that, to its members at least, its existence is for a greater good. That is not really such a self-evident platitude. On the one hand, because it is so, so soon as we hear of a new movement, we wonder what part of human life is now to be improved or to improve itself. Therefore there is this implied new activity for good. On the other hand, there is the inevitable sense that that action, within the direction of the membership, is desirable. Therefore the activity includes a certain sense of personal exclusiveness. The movement, especially if it is a religious movement, stands in two dangers: there is the danger that its spiritual aspect may become completely subordinate to its worldly activity, and consequently exist only so long as, and so far as, that activity is active; secondly, it is in grave danger of acquiring a false sense of *amour propre*, the idea that what matters is not primarily the solution of a particular problem, but its solution by that particular movement.

In this essay I want to outline what are the original motives and intentions of a new Catholic youth movement, the Seven Years' Association; so these matters concern us closely. Without doubt the fashion in movements is an outcome of the fashion in service: social service, for all its merit, is temporarily a fashionable affair. And there is this sense that a movement has an inherent merit, in that it aims at doing good. Now the S.Y.A. does not do this, and, in consequence, escapes both the two dangers of which I have just written, the danger of slavery to a particular activity and of a false *amour propre* concerning its success. We have deliberately chosen the harder course of attempting to build a unity, not upon what is given to or gained from the movement, but upon a particular religious

standpoint,* which remains the one common denominator among members—that is, an acceptance as a rule of life, and as an obligation upon joining the movement of what are commonly called the six Precepts of the Church. Thus is it more true to say that we exist, as a movement, to be good than to do good. The spiritual aspect is kept secure because it is dominant, for any activity that is undertaken is purely a subordinate expression of a religious unity; and from that it must follow that the success of such activity is not the test of the success of the movement as a movement, which in turn releases us from the false sense that the importance of the activity's success is in its source.

To be more particular, one may put it thus: In the first place the S.Y.A. builds itself upon a corporate acceptance through membership of the Precept obligation. There is no initial attraction to membership by a programme of works. There is no emphasis of deeds or action, such as is so frequent in the appeal that is made by the Church to youth. Instead, a rule of life is stated, and enrolment is sought from all those who will bind themselves to that rule, and that rule alone, simply because they believe that such a rule may help them more worthily to worship God and more really to acknowledge the Kingship of Christ. The religious unity is paramount. There may be activity in the present locally, or in the future more generally; but this activity is not our *raison d'être*. Thus such activity does not directly affect that unity of Catholic youth which we are striving to enrol.

Secondly, and because such is our orientation, we would challenge the general attitude of the Church towards works. As I have already written, there is a fashion in service, and there is a fashion to believe that, so soon as the Church takes some part in social problems, the validity of the religion for which she stands is strengthened. The S.Y.A. stands for a different attitude. We believe the validity of our religion must be unaffected by any passing human expression.† It does matter to our human society that its needs are recognized by the Church, but there must be no sense of *amour propre* among Churchmen that they must gain the credit for solution. It is for them to see that each proffered solution is tested by the Church in order to find out whether it is a Christian solution;

* The standpoint of Christianity and Catholicism is the essential basis; not merely its outward evidence in a list of Precepts. We are not seeking codification or formalism, but a unity built upon a genuine Christian life. The Precepts cannot be more than a pledge of our sincerity and an ordered guide of our disposition.

† Cf. Maritain, *The Things that are not Caesar's*, p. 32 (Hart Library Edition): "The faithful heart is well aware that, in the mystic Body of Christ, the shortcomings of human nature still serve the most holy action of God, which never fails to attain its goal."

and what matters supremely is that any solution of our social problems should be Christian. Thus our Churchmanship, in so far as it is demonstrated in our citizenship, must bring this new potential: that we discharge our duties as citizens better, ethically and so religiously, because we make our citizenship continually subordinate to our Churchmanship, and that we exact as a *sine qua non* the condition that all social action shall be compatible with Christianity.

Such an attitude is uncommon to-day. The attraction of what is sometimes called the Public School religion lies in its insistence that deeds matter and any particular faith or ethic which prompts them is only accidental. If we may make one protest through our existence as a movement, may it be against this widespread heresy. I would plead that it is essential that our ethic is the outcome of our religious faith. As Maritain points out in his essay on *Religion and Culture*, the dominant culture of to-day is anthropocentric; it is "humanism *dissociated** from the Incarnation." The humanist ethic, for all its first attraction, leads us to the blind alley of anthropocentrality. The only release is in a God-centrality, which involves an acknowledgment of the primacy of the spiritual, and which involves that an ethic is conditioned by, or subordinate to, our religious faith.†

From the point of view of starting a new movement such a foundation may seem precarious, perhaps even nebulous. Movements have so vastly stressed their programme of activity that their very merits are often measured in accordance with the length of their programme. But it has seemed to be essential, if the S.Y.A. is to be in any sense an important Catholic youth movement, that we shall begin with no programme, save what we are and try to be, practising Catholics. That is a basis which lasts longer than any programme of works; and works, which we do not under-estimate, acquire a more proper proportion, since they are not essential to the existence of the movement, nor do they affect directly the progress of that movement towards an increase of Catholic practice in the Anglican Communion.

Then there is the word "youth." Of this there is less to write. The time seems at last to have come when not only youth itself is tired of its name, but so too are its elders. In

* His italics.

† Cf. Dr. Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, p. 143: "The Church represents truth, dogma, as an absolute fact, based upon itself, independent of all confirmation from the moral or even from the practical sphere. Truth is truth because it is truth. . . . The will has to admit that it is blind and needs the light, the leadership, and the organizing formative power of truth. It must admit, as a fundamental principle, the primacy of knowledge over the will, of the Logos over the Ethos."

fact, it may have seemed unsound to confine any new movement to youth, because youth is so over-sought, over-written, over-cared for, and over-tired with concern. But in this case it was youth that mattered. The Oxford Movement's centenary has just passed, and it is a natural thing that we should wonder what to-day's youth, who will inherit so rich a treasure of worship and renaissance, will make of its trusteeship. So the S.Y.A. in these next seven years would particularly prepare us for that inheritance, and prepare us with a determination that in our own time that treasure will increase, and, so increased, be handed on to others, some of whom may be alive to celebrate the second centenary. Thus it had to be a youth movement, for all the immediate distaste in that phrase. But also we had to avoid at once the usual tendency in youth movements that are religious; for, beside the customary anxiety over activity, there is either an over-eagerness for piety or else a benevolent attitude that discounts religious obligation. On the one side are those many Guilds that seize upon and distort an adolescent attraction of religious emotionalism and the æsthetic allure of ceremonial; on the other are those numerous conspiracies to keep youth within a Church's ægis by some bribe of pleasure or activity. So we have as our only rule for membership the observance of the Precepts. The appeal is for discipline; and even in these early days there is a case in one town of an S.Y.A. station causing four first Confessions to be made in one week.

The Seven Years' Association is an association of the young laity of the Anglican Communion. It is limited to those who were born this century. It has no obligatory subscription, but contributions to the funds are sought. There is the one and only obligation upon joining—an acceptance of the Precepts as a membership obligation. Members are organized by stations, and stations are formed for towns or districts, not for a single parish. There is no essential activity, so those who take much pleasure in the multiplication of committees will find here little satisfaction. And it has already been noticeable that many young men and women who have joined have been thankful that we avoid either a feverish activity which resembles "stunting" or any host of internal regulations. As a religious movement we have been content to make a normal religious basis our sole concern; and, though nothing is hereby added to that which many a Catholic would term his normal obligation, the S.Y.A. has a usefulness in that it is not anxious to elaborate the simple practice of a lay Catholic, but at the same time may found an organization upon which can be based a Catholic lay apostolate. We may be said to be seeking a normality

almost to the extent of being business-like in our Catholicism; but our security lies in the fact that our essential motive is a re-recognition of the Kingship of Christ. "The universal Kingship of Christ has a dual nature: it is both spiritual and temporal."*

Thirdly, this youth movement is Catholic. This is clearly implied in its Precept obligation; but there are two aspects in which this is of very great importance.

Reference has already been made in a note to the primacy of the Logos over the Ethos, and this is clearly the same principle as the Thomist principle of the primacy of the spiritual. Such a principle seems to be implied in the Precepts, because of the acknowledged centrality of the Mass, the liturgy. What is so important in the modern circumstance is the relation of this principle to the problems which sociologists are ever trying to solve. May I quote once more from Dr. Guardini: "The liturgy, on the contrary (*i.e.*, as opposed to non-liturgical devotions), is primarily occupied in forming the fundamental Christian temper. By it man is to be induced to determine correctly his essential relation to God, and to put himself right in regard to reverence for God, love and faith, atonement and the desire for sacrifice. As a result of this spiritual disposition, it follows that when action is required of him he will do what is right."†

Now it is just that sense of order, which one may justly call the Catholic sense of order, that is lacking to-day, and its absence must lead us to the grave danger of which I wrote at the beginning of this essay of acquiring a false sense of *amour propre*. Nor is the mistake confined to non-Christians. There are many Christians, and how many sermons bear this out, who reverse the order of Dr. Guardini's last sentence and say that from good actions will follow a good spiritual disposition. They place the Ethos before the Logos, and as a natural consequence they believe that the Logos is strengthened if the solution of the ethical problem is found by one of them who acknowledges that Logos at all. To put it more plainly, they believe that each good thing that a Christian may do to solve our social problems is a proof of his Christianity—and so, they argue, of the essential validity of Christianity—and thus they are anxious that Christians should find more solutions than non-Christians. It follows that they are feverishly trying to understand the technical aspects of these problems instead of contenting themselves with the worship of God.

By that I do not plead for an obscurantist disinterest. But what is so necessary is that we place a complete enough

* Maritain, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

† Dr. Guardini, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

reliance upon Christianity to claim, as Dr. Guardini does, that *it will follow* from a spiritual disposition that when action is required we shall do right. For this must alter our attitude towards social problems. These are, to a great extent, technical problems, and, whatever his personal holiness, an amateur is not technically better fitted to find solution solely because he is a Christian. What matters is that Christians—and here I plead with those who preach sermons—should be taught first the worship of God by living Christianity, not merely liking it, and counting this the first necessity in their life. That, secondly, they should have faith enough to know that the better their practice of religion, the better their Churchmanship, so the better their citizenship; by faith this is automatic, for they have “sought *first* the Kingdom of God.” Then it should follow that they acknowledge a technical aspect in every social problem with which it is necessary and desirable that the expert should deal; the Churchman’s responsibility remains in that he must see that the solution is compatible with Christianity. It is not for the preacher to solve each problem; to an extent the ethic may be detached from the Logos. But the ethic is always to be subordinate to the Logos, so that the preacher must see, and every Churchman must see, that every application of the ethic to social problems is in accord with the Logos.

The other point which arises from what has been written is the necessity for a more widespread instruction in the faith. Again the sermons of to-day are often at fault. In the majority of cases they are preached upon conduct or devotion. Occasionally they are concerned with foreign affairs or social problems. But if it is right to claim a primacy of the Logos over the Ethos, it is essential that sermons should instruct us in the theological basis of those very things which Dr. Guardini mentions: reverence for God, love and faith, atonement, and the desire for sacrifice. For these are the ways by which we may learn our essential relation to God; and the resultant “spiritual disposition” must be effected in other than the emotional plane alone.

It is not an easy thing for a layman to ask: it is more attractive to sit meekly and in silence in the pew. But there is no other way to correct the modern heresy, which finds a complete primacy in the Ethos, and leads us, as Maritain points out, to a “humanism *dissociated* from the Incarnation.” It is a reassociation which we must keep on seeking, for it is the divinity of our faith that demands a subordination of everything to the Logos, or, to put it another way, a proper association of everything to the Incarnation, and only thus can we test whether our ethic is Christian. It is in this respect that the pulpit

matters so greatly. What is preached cannot affect the validity of the Logos; it does not touch the supremacy of the Mass, of the liturgy, over all other forms of worship. But in the application of Churchmanship to citizenship, or, rather, the transformation of citizenship so conditioned that, above issues of technique, of reason, of humanism is raised the primacy of the spiritual, we must seek an instructional guidance from the clergy. In the words of the German philosopher, Peter Wust: "When we have one and all effected this self-reformation, each in his own place, at once, inevitably and simultaneously, a force of attraction, natural and supernatural, will be generated so potent that none of those standing without will be able finally to resist it."*

So, because this youth movement is Catholic, the primary appeal has been for instruction and discipline. It may seem strange that, having left the more usual course of attracting youth to a religious movement and giving instead a rule of life and an insistence on disciplined Churchmanship, we should also have appealed for a desire for instruction. It might not have been difficult to awaken a great emotional fervency as has been done in the Group Movement, or to evoke a busy officiousness by calling for social service. But these two courses would have followed blindly the mistakes of to-day. Besides discipline, we must want to restore dignity to Churchmanship. The sentimental attraction of the more nebulous conception of Church-membership is strong; but it is a sentimentality. The ethic is not enough; it must be dependent upon the Logos and the Truth. "In the beginning was the Word"; not will, nor action, nor ethic, but the Word, the Truth. If a youth movement is to be in any sense a lay apostolate, it is a primary condition that youth goes back to that Truth; that we cease from defining religion as either a course to make us good or to make us do good, and place first that religion shall enable us to worship God.

Thus, what we are seeking through the Catholic Youth Movement, the Seven Years' Association, is an enthusiasm; but not through activity. However busy a person is, he can join, for it adds nothing to that which we believe is involved in being a Catholic. They do not join for what they give, nor for what they get—only for what they are; and its strength and effectiveness is in the solidarity of membership. So this enthusiasm is for a way of life; and that is not the same as the Group Movement's quality of life. There is no idea of self-satisfaction because we are of some special quality. Rather we agree upon the fundamental necessity of a way of life, the real way of the Cross, the way of Catholicism and the sacraments.

* Peter Wust, *Crisis in the West*, p. 67.

It is because it is necessary for a worthy worship of God that we are enthusiastic about it. The membership, the association, does not arise because we want to be especially High Church, nor because we want to feel especially good, nor because we are highbrow about our religion or meticulous as to its practice. It arises because of an enthusiasm at the Oxford Centenary Congress, because we know that that enthusiasm was good and had to be kept and made more rich and more universal, and all that because we know that it was, and is, the best we can do in the worship of God.

PETER WINCKWORTH.

President S.Y.A.

THE MYSTERY OF JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

THE walking of Jesus on the sea is probably quite the least understood of all His miracles: and because superficially it is spectacular, and therefore as such irreconcilable with His personality and whole life-aim, it is virtually ignored if not discredited, or at best left unexplained and unplumbed. Mr. H. G. Wood, commenting on the Marcan version of it, writes: "The miracle . . . is difficult. It involves a *display* of power over nature which is unlike Jesus. One is tempted to believe that allegory has been materialized here. In any case, the story is most helpful when allegorized. . . . But the incident is associated with good history. . . . Nor is it easy to assign a motive for the story, if it be legend." But no single Gospel miracle is recorded *by accident*: each has its own inner mystery, and therefore its own revelation implicit in it. This miracle, being recorded by two of the synoptists (Mark vi. 47-56, Matt. xiv. 24-36), and also in St. John (vi. 16-21), has a substantial claim to be considered as intrinsically throwing further important light upon our Lord; for none of the Evangelists record His miracles as miracles, but simply as signs—to use St. John's own word—manifestations of His divine personality. This miracle is illuminated only as the three accounts of it are unified: and as it is taken as the direct and inevitable outcome of what preceded it, and the whole as the necessary forerunner of all that followed it.

The antecedent facts as gleaned from St. John and St. Mark were that immediately after the feeding of the five thousand Jesus, realizing that the people were desirous of taking Him by force to make Him king, compelled His disciples to take

ship before Him to the other side of the lake, while He dismissed the crowd and withdrew alone into a mountain to pray. It is clear that the people have raised for Him an issue which so taxes Him mentally, morally, and spiritually, that He cannot delay an instant getting away from all human influence to ascertain in solitude the Will of His Father. The urgency with which He had to fling Himself isolatedly upon the Father shews that the issue is not a mere variant or repetition of the kingly temptation in the wilderness, but an altogether fresh issue. There it was question of obtaining the "kingdoms of the world" by compromise with the devil: and there that temptation was finally rejected. But here is something altogether different. *The people desire to make Him king*: and has not the establishment of His kingship—the Divine sovereignty of love—been the goal of all His ministry? Is this now the threshold of consummation? Have the people recognized *Him* in His selfless love as Lord of all: or are they merely desirous for material benefits to be expected under His rule? And supposing it is only this lower motive, could He not, by yielding to their desire of kingship, more quickly lead them on to true vision? Here was an absolute crisis in His ministry: to accept or reject the will of the people now would stamp the whole remainder of His ministry irrevocably—either way the ministry could not remain what it was before. The tide of popular acclaim had risen: and henceforward it must be a definite swimming either with or against it. To baulk the people of their desire would certainly be to forfeit public support. On the one hand there beckoned apparent assured success, and on the other equally assured failure threatened; between them He had to make deliberate choice, a choice to which resultant events would hold Him.

Our Lord had always His own means of determining the right and wrong course of action—means unlike ours. He withdrew from human advice, and ruled out every consideration of human expediency. Instead, He betook Himself to the Father, to seek afresh in contemplative prayer the further revelation of His All-Holy and All-Loving Will. He dropped the human problem at the Father's feet, and concerned Himself with the Father Himself: and through His worship and self-oblation the Father poured back illuminating light.

In the last resort all fundamental human problems receive illumination only in relation to their eternal Other-world setting, and not to their partial and incomplete earthly time-setting. We dare not, and could not, try to reconstruct the way in which, on this night alone in prayer, our Lord received from His Father the illumination so urgently sought. But

that there was given Him an interior vision is shewn us by St. John (xviii. 36), a vision so transcendent that even at the end of His life He could only veil the inner core of it behind a negative hint: "My Kingdom is not of this world: if My Kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My Kingdom not from hence." The knowledge underlying this pronouncement to Pilate could not have been knowledge penetrated through the "kingdom" temptation of the wilderness: for had He had it before, the kingdom-issue raised by the people would have presented no crisis.

The hint to Pilate is in the negative, but the vision as received by Him was essentially creative; and to receive it He must needs have been taken through contemplative prayer right out to the Other Side, His body remaining on the mountain-side, His spirit freed of space and time into Eternity, into His Kingdom of Love Omnipotent. Then on this King of Love, rapt in communion with the Father, breaks in the sense of His disciples, His beloved, in need: and since Love's essence is identification with the beloved, is instantaneous forthgoing to the joy or sorrow of the beloved, He goes to them at once. The walking on the sea is no spectacular "display" of power over nature: it is something unself-consciously, unthinkingly accomplished by Love Omnipotent, which neither heeds nor notices obstacles arising in the path of its self-donation. How should it be any more difficult for Him then—caught up into the vision of the consummated Kingdom of Love Invincible—to walk on sea than on land? If human love faced by need or danger can—as it does—rise to feats impossible to the ordinary man in cold blood, how much more so then Divine Love! That Jesus as man should walk on the sea was merely a "miracle" *incidental* to the infinitely profounder and more miraculous miracle that He as man should so *love* as He loved.

The Gospel narrative of the disciples' reception of Jesus now throws strangely corroborative and further revealing light upon His interior experience in this mystery. St. Mark records how "they, when they saw Him walking on the sea, supposed that it was an apparition, and cried out: for they all saw Him, and were troubled." And St. Matthew, after recording the incident—peculiar to his Gospel—of St. Peter's walking on the sea, adds: "And when they were gone up into the boat, the wind ceased. And they that were in the boat worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God." The Greek word here translated "apparition" is *φάντασμα*. Is it not significant to contrast this with the superficially similar incident of the Resurrection appearance to the disciples in the Upper

Room ? " But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit." Here the Greek word translated "spirit" is πνεῦμα. These two words shew that there was an *objective* dissimilarity in the two appearances. πνεῦμα is a spirit, a spiritual being: φάντασμα is an appearance, image, phantom, spectre, vision. The clue to the difference is perhaps to be found in the earlier episode: " And they that were in the boat worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God." It was not the miraculous *qua* miraculous which elicited this. There had *before* been numbers of other miracles as spectacular as this in their differing natures: the raising of the dead; wondrous healings of all kinds, including the taming of the Gerasene demoniac; the feeding of the five thousand; but none of these had led the disciples out to recognition of His Divine Sonship. The earlier stilling of the storm left them fearful and *wondering*, but not *worshipping*: there is here something manifest *about Himself apart from His actions* that reveals His Divine Sonship. Is this "something" a pre-Transfiguration transfiguration ? There on the Mount of Transfiguration the vision of His "exodus" set His whole incarnate being alight with the light of the Beyond: and what more likely, almost inevitable, than that the vision of His consummated Kingdom should also irradiate His whole incarnate being with the light of that Other-world whither He was taken to receive the vision ? Was it not that on the sea He appeared incarnate and transfigured, the human Jesus in the setting of the Divine: and in the Upper Room that the Divine Jesus appeared in the setting of a humanity taken up into the Godhead ?

Difficulty has been found by some in "accepting" this "confession," in the boat, of Jesus as the Son of God, as anticipating the great Confession at Cæsarea Philippi, rightly regarded as the watershed both of our Lord's ministry and of the training of the disciples. But surely this difficulty arises only as the confession is regarded from the side of the disciples ? Regarded from our Lord's side the difficulty is dispelled: and not only dispelled, but the confession itself in turn furnishes further corroboration and light upon this mystery. From a study of our Lord's life as a whole we know that at moments of such great crisis and vision as the Baptism, or Transfiguration, the Father gave to the Son some supernatural pledge of confirmation: and is not this crisis and vision of "the Kingdom not of this world" a parallel instance, in which some similar supernatural pledge from the Father is to be *expected* ? Here, in the disciples' worshipping "Of a truth Thou art the Son of God" is no spiritually, or intellectually, thought-out consciously deliberate recognition and acknowledgment of our Lord's

Divinity: but it is the Holy Spirit using the disciples as the mouthpiece of the Father's confirmation to Jesus of His Kingship of a Kingdom not of this world, the gift of the first-fruits of the royal homage of worship in spirit and truth which His Father desires Him to receive throughout eternity. The disciples know not at all the real inner content of their verbal acclamation; Jesus does: it is the Father's pledge of His true divination of the course His ministry must follow.

The intensity, and objective as well as subjective reality, of the interior experience and the Divine pledge in this mystery is attested by Jesus Himself. St. John tells us that "on the morrow" He is found of the multitude: and in speaking to them out of the overflowing vision just received He says: "Verily, verily I say unto you, ye seek Me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled. Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you: *for Him the Father, even God, hath sealed*": ἐσφράγισεν, sealed, confirmed, stamped with approval. This mystery of the walking on the sea might equally, and with deeper truth, be called the mystery of the King's Inheritance.

MAISIE SPENS.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

CIVILIZATION AND THE FAITH

SIR,

Mr. Christopher Dawson's very interesting article on Civilization and the Faith, in the February number of THEOLOGY, lays itself open to question in some respects by the ambiguities of its phraseology. "There is a general feeling to-day," he says, "that war, business, even the State, are unchristian." Does he mean that large numbers of people think that as it is wrong to fight, so it is wrong to buy and sell, to pass laws and to obey them? This is a staggering statement. The growing condemnation of war by Christians is surely of war *in itself* as an essentially evil activity; economics and politics are activities which may be good or bad according to the Christian or non-Christian spirit in which they are conducted. Again, Mr. Dawson never explains what meaning he attaches to that ambiguous word "the State." Does he mean the "Government"—the persons holding political office and authority? Or does he mean the political organization which Aristotle described as existing to make life good? Or does he mean the whole body of citizens, Christian and pagan alike? In a society where political responsibility is as widely distributed as it is in England to-day, the Christian citizen, if he is to obey our Lord's command to render to Cæsar those things that are Cæsar's, owes a great deal to his fellow-citizens who with him make up the State, in whichever sense the word is taken. He owes them the service of his thought and his will, in the endeavour to use our rich inheritance of law, of public spirit, of experience, of statesmanship in the service of Christ, and to do his part in bringing the society and civilization of which we are members into closer relation with His will. Mr. Dawson's exhortations not to accept the standards of a materialistic civilization are perilously near a command *not* to pay the tribute penny to Cæsar, but to lay it up in a napkin.

Again, Mr. Dawson says that "men cannot change the city of man into the city of God," yet, on the other hand, "Christianity called a new world into existence." Can a faith achieve results without believers? And what is the meaning of a "new world" in which "humanity remains much the same as it has always been"? Mr. Dawson's doctrine seems to have affinities with that Manicheism whose legacy descended through Augustine to Bradwardine and Calvin, a doctrine ultimately at war with the gospel of the Incarnation. "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common or unclean." If the State, business, and civilization are godless, it is not because they are functions of Ahriman and permanently irredeemable; it is because we as Christians have failed to claim them as fields of Christian activity, and have allowed them to be dominated by the worship of Mammon or of tribal gods.

Yours faithfully,
HELEN M. CAM.

GIRTON COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
March 14, 1934.

VENI CREATOR SPIRITUS*

THIS hymn must always be of peculiar interest to English Churchmen, not merely on account of its great antiquity and intrinsic value, but as being the only metrical hymn thought worthy of a place in the Book of Common Prayer. There are two versions of it in *The Ordering of Priests*. The shorter and familiar one is by Bishop John Cosin (1627). The longer one is said to have been written by Cranmer,† but it is hard to believe that these cumbrous and long-drawn-out lines really came from the pen of the man to whom the Prayer Book is indebted for so many fine translations and adaptations.

Who is the author of the Latin original? St. Ambrose, St. Gregory the Great, and Charlemagne have all been suggested. It is now widely held to be the work of Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz, in the ninth century. But no one can say with any certainty who wrote it. "We do know that for a thousand years Christians have used it, whenever they have sought the Spirit's aid." "In England," it has been said,‡ "since the days of William the Conqueror, no king has been crowned, no priest ordained, no church consecrated, no ecclesiastical council held, without the singing of this hymn." Of late years, too, it has become usual for the Holy Ghost to be invoked in these ancient words before the laying-on of hands in Confirmation—a practice which, strange to say, appears to be forbidden in the Revised Prayer Book.

The *Veni Creator* is, as we have observed, the only metrical hymn admitted to the Prayer Book, and it has recently been noted§ as "a very beautiful feature in the English rite" (of *The Ordering of Priests*), that a time for silent prayer intervenes between the examination of the candidates and the singing of the *Veni Creator Spiritus*. Have we here a hint that at all times, whenever the hymn is used, it is fitting that this great act of devotion to the Holy Ghost should be preceded by a pause for silent thought and recollection, that so we may be prepared to pray with intelligence as well as fervour—in a word, to pray *in* the Spirit and *by* the Spirit *to* the Spirit, and ask aright for the many great things which the hymn encourages us to seek from Him? Keble, in his poem "Ordination" in *The Christian Year*, seems to make, or at least include, something of the same point, that a pause for silent prayer is very appropriate:

Ere yet the pure high-breathed lay,
"Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,"
Rise floating on its dove-like way.

The suggestion is, it appears, that the silence before the singing of the hymn will greatly help towards winning from the Holy Spirit an abundant answer to the petitions contained in the hymn.

Perhaps at this point it is permissible to quote the striking testimony borne by another great Tractarian and master of the spiritual life as to the unique importance of the hymn we are discussing. Dr. Pusey wrote:

* An address given in substance at a gathering of the clergy of the East Charing Deanery, in the diocese of Canterbury.

† E. C. Ratcliff, in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 275, speaks of it quite definitely as "Cranmer's bad translation."

‡ The Rev. G. R. Balleine, in his *Message of the Prayer Book*, a small work of great value to which I am much indebted.

§ Dr. W. K. Firminger, *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 681.

"If you make it a rule to say with sincerity the first verse of the hymn—the only hymn in the Prayer Book, 'Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire'—every morning without failing, it will in time do more for you than any other prayer I know, except the Lord's Prayer."

Turning to the hymn itself, there is no doubt that the version which is so familiar and so full of sacred associations, very imperfectly represents the original. At the close of this article will be found, side by side, the Latin original and a quite literal rendering in English, a study of which will show in what respects Bishop Cosin's version of the hymn is defective, and at the same time make clear the immense difficulty confronting any future translator, and the unlikelihood that the terse Latin of the original will ever be reproduced in English without loss either to its thought or to its beauty and dignity.*

It will be convenient first to notice some of the great thoughts of the original which are lost in the familiar English version.

1. There is no mention of the creative work of the Spirit, "with which the hymn so grandly opens,"† and which is, indeed, twice referred to in verse 1: "Come, *Creator Spirit* . . . the hearts which Thou hast *created*."

2. Our Lord's name for the Holy Ghost, the *Comforter*, or *Paraclete*, is also passed by, though verse 2 begins with, "Thou who art called *Paraclete*."

3. The fact that the Holy Ghost is the "gift of God most High" and given "by the Father's promise" is omitted; nor is it made clear that He is Himself "sevenfold in gift" rather than imparting sevenfold gifts—one gift with seven manifestations.

With this brief notice of some defects of Cosin's version, the way is cleared for a fuller statement or summary of the teachings and thoughts as set forth in the original.

1. First, then, we are provided with a very full and complete creed of the Holy Spirit.

It has been already pointed out that He is described as the *gift of God*, bestowed after being long promised. His *godhead* appears in the fact that He is twice spoken of as *creating*, and throughout He is addressed in prayer and appealed to as the direct bestower of grace and of all spiritual gifts. And at the close He is confessed as proceeding from the Father and the Son—"the Spirit of each"—and as the means through whom knowledge of the Father and of the Son may be acquired.

His *distinct personality* is even more clear, and it is proclaimed in the same way as by our Lord in St. John's Gospel—namely, by the repeated application to Him of the personal pronouns *Thou*, *Thee*, *He*, etc. There is a passage in Bishop Moule's book, *Veni Creator*, in which this point, which is often misunderstood, is well brought out. After remarking that "the neuter Πνεῦμα is associated by our Lord repeatedly‡ and markedly with the masculine Παράκλητος, and the masculines ὅς, ἐκεῖνος, αὐτός (John xiv. 16, 17; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 8), he turns to other Scriptural passages where the *Spirit* is mentioned, and wherever the word *spirit* occurs he substitutes for it the phrase *He, not it*. Thus, *He, not it*,§ moved upon

* The renderings by E. Caswall (A. and M. 347) and by Robert Bridges (E.H. 154) have at least the merit of preserving the main thoughts of the original.

† Evan Daniel.

‡ Though not invariably.

§ It is probable that many will not follow the Bishop in his interpretation of Old Testament passages, but if it be granted that the word *spirit* in these and other passages of the Old Testament refers to the Holy Spirit, it must be admitted that the Bishop's method of enforcing the truth of His personality is effective.

the face of the waters; *He, not it*, strove with man; *He, not it*, spake by the prophets; *He, not it*, came upon the Blessed Virgin, and anointed her Son; *He, not it*, filled the Apostles on the Day of Pentecost, etc. So in our hymn the Holy Spirit is set before us not merely as an influence or inspiration of God, but as a *living Person*, as *He, not it*. And He is so set before us by employment of the same language, as in St. John's Gospel by our Lord, by repeated use of personal pronouns: *tu, te, qui* (thou, thee, who). He is, in a word, declared to be God the Holy Ghost—a Person within the Godhead.

2. Then how rich is the hymn in symbols used in Scripture to express the manifold operations of the Spirit. Five such symbols are found in the Latin original. Thus we have:

(a) *Wind* or *breath*, which gives life and power; for in Latin, as in Greek and Hebrew, the same word may be translated by either spirit or wind. So John iii. 8 may be rendered either *the wind bloweth* (A.V.) or *the Spirit breatheth* (R.V. marg.) (cf. Job xxxiii. 4; Ps. civ. 29, 30; Ezek. xxxvii. 9, 14; Acts ii. 2, 4).

(b) *Fire*, which purifies and gives light and heat (cf. Matt. iii. 11, 12) ("He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire . . . and thoroughly cleanse") (Acts ii. 3, 4; Rev. iv. 5).

(c) *Water*, which refreshes and gives life and renewal (cf. John iv. 14; vii. 37-39).

(d) *Oil* of unction or anointing, used for the consecration of priests and others (cf. 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; 1 John ii. 20, 27).

(e) *Finger of God*, by which His purposes are carried out and brought to perfection (cf. Deut. ix. 10; Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20).

In this hymn, then, the Holy Ghost is called upon to *come* under all these symbols or figures, as *spirit* or wind, as *fire*, as *living fountain* (i.e., of water), as *spiritual unction* or anointing, and as *the finger* of God's right hand.

3. But the hymn not only employs symbols to express the Spirit's manifold activities. It bids us, and with even greater emphasis, call upon Him in plain words—call upon Him to do His blessed work, and to do it in every part of our being—minds, hearts, lips, senses and flesh.* He is to be invited to visit the minds of His people, to fill our hearts with grace from above, to enrich duly our lips with speech (e.g., in prayer, praise and discourse), to kindle light in our senses, to pour love into our hearts, continually to strengthen with virtue (or power) the weakness of our flesh, to drive far away from us our great foe, forthwith to give peace (i.e., peace in our hearts with God and man), to go before us as guide, that we may escape everything that is hurtful, and, lastly, to grant us true knowledge of the Father and the Son, and abiding faith in Himself as the Spirit of each.

4. Further, there is the very significant fact that the hymn is addressed to the Holy Spirit. Such addresses are familiar to us in hymns and prayers, but there is no obvious authority for them in Scripture. Did our author, then, originate this direct form of invocation of the Spirit? And, if so, what led him, or possibly an earlier writer, thus to address himself to the Holy Ghost? Was it the name given to Him by our Lord, the Paraclete, which seems to mean "one called in to help"? If so, we may claim that the Church was taught by our Lord Himself to invoke the Spirit's aid.

* It is to be noticed, too, that the hymn is Catholic in its range, the plural number being used throughout.

Indeed, this seems to be suggested by the opening words of the second verse: "Come . . . Thou who art called Paraclete."

5. But the appeal is not only to Him as Paraclete—the Friend who is near, and yet who desires to be invited, to be called upon with some urgency for His help—but also, and still more emphatically, *as Creator*. Possibly we do not think of Him as Creator very much. Yet, if He is God, He must possess and exercise creative powers,* as indeed the Scriptures appear to indicate (Gen. i. 2; Job xxxiii. 4; Ps. xxxiii. 6, civ. 30). But granting this, we may still ask, Why appeal to Him so urgently by this attribute and, first of all, in the very first line of the hymn? Why pray to Him to come *as Creator*, to do for us the great things for which the hymn is about to plead? The answer to this question seems to have puzzled the early translators, for, as we have seen, all reference to Him as Creator is omitted in their versions. But the answer is surely not far to seek. It is an appeal to Him not to leave His work unfinished. "Thou, who hast created us, complete what Thou hast begun in us, and bring it to perfection. Come, Creator Spirit, visit the minds of Thy people. Fill with grace from above the hearts which Thou hast created."

Dr. Swete has truly said† of this hymn that it "survives among us as a monument of the devotion of the ancient Church to the Holy Ghost, and gathers up the best teaching of the patristic period in words which still express the deepest desires of all Christian people." Seldom, indeed, has so much been written on a great subject in words at once so few and so complete and so sublime.

VENI CREATOR

Veni, Creator Spiritus,
Mentes tuorum visita:
Imple superna gratia
Quæ tu creasti pectora.

Qui diceris Paraclitus,
Altissimi donum Dei,
Fons vivus, ignis, charitas
Et spiritualis unctio.

Tu septiformis munere,
Digitus paternæ dextræ,
Tu rite promissum Patris
Sermone ditans guttura.

Accende lumen sensibus,
Infunde amorem cordibus,
Infirma nostri corporis
Virtute firmans perpeti.

Hostem repellas longius
Pacemque dones protinus:
Ductore sic te prævio
Vitemus omne noxium.

Per te sciamus da Patrem
Noscamus atque Filium:
Te utriusque Spiritum
Credamus omni tempore.

Come, Creator Spirit,
Visit the minds of Thy people:
Fill with grace from above
The hearts which Thou hast created.

Thou, who are called Paraclete,
Gift of God most high,
Living Fountain, Fire, Love,
And spiritual Unction.

Thou, sevenfold in gift,
Finger of the Father's right hand,
Thou, by the Father's promise
Enriching duly lips with speech.

Kindle light in our senses,
Pour love into our hearts,
Continually strengthening with virtue
The weakness of our flesh.

Drive far away the foe,
And give peace forthwith:
With Thee going before as guide
May we shun every hurtful thing.

Grant us through Thee to know the Father,
And to know the Son:
At all times to believe
Thee to be the spirit of each.

F. DOUGLAS ROBINSON,

Chilworth, Romsey.

* Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 337.

† *Ibid.*, p. 352.

THE "COMMONS" OF THE 1928 PRAYER BOOK

THOSE who have used the additional services of the 1928 Book for some years now will probably agree that the provision made for Black Letter Saints' Days is defective. More variety is needed, for one thing. The suggestions that follow are a first attempt at detailed criticism; others will be able to improve on them.

Of a Martyr or Martyrs. The Epistle, from Heb. xi., xii., is too much in the grand style for common use, especially when little is known about the Saint in question. The Roman missal gives a rich choice of lessons. Of these, Wisdom iii. 1-9 is particularly appropriate when death by fire is commemorated; there is no reason to stop at v. 8, with R. The reference to "the sufferings of Christ" in 2 Cor. i. 3-7 makes this section suitable for a martyr. R has 1 Pet. iv. 13-19. There is no reason to omit v. 12; so we may choose either vv. 12-14, or 12-19. Better still, vv. 15-18 could be omitted, so that the passage runs vv. 12-14, 19. To these, selected from R, 2 Macc. vi. 27-31, introduced by "Eleazar said," might be added, since the conception of martyrdom seems to have been first formed during the Maccabæan struggle.

Of the Gospels in R, John xii. 24-26 seems the most useful addition to Matt. xvi. 24-26.

Of a Doctor or Confessor. There is no reason for combining the two. The lections given, Wisdom vii. 7-14 and Matt. xiii. 51, 52, are quite out of place for, say, Edward the Confessor. But they will do excellently for a Doctor.

This leaves us to find new ones for a Confessor. For the Epistle 1 Cor. iv. 9b-13 (omit v. 14 of R) is suitable. Other suggested lessons are Wisdom v. 1-5 and Eccus. xlv. 8-15. Matt. x. 24-33, with its reference to confessing Christ, is the obvious Gospel.

Of a Bishop. The present Epistle, 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16, is not self-explanatory. It makes good sense when read as particularly addressed to Timothy after a general description of the duties of bishops and others; and it is good that the bishop should appear as a defender of the faith. But the congregation may not see the point. A selection of verses from the R Lesson (Heb. xiii.) would be better—vv. 7, 8, 15-17. The 1928 Gospel, Mark iv. 26-32, contains two parables about the growth of the Church. Matt. xxiv. 42-47, as in R, seems better.

Of an Abbot. The 1928 lesson from Prov. x. 27-32 is inferior to R (Eccus. xlv. 1b-5a). This might begin: "A man beloved of God and men, whose memorial is blessed." Our Gospel, from Luke vi. 20-23a, misses the special marks of the religious life. Substitute Matt. xix. 27-29, from R.

Of Missionaries. Requires no comment.

Of a Virgin or Virgin Martyr. The lesson, from Eccus. li. 10-12, is a shortened form of the Roman Lesson of a Virgin Martyr. Though the later verses, referring to the flames, have been omitted, it is unsuitable for Catherine of Siena, and still more so for the festivals of the B.V.M. (September 8 and December 8), for which it is apparently designed. With these exceptions, all Virgins in the Anglican Calendar are Martyrs; clearly then separate provision should be made for the two classes. If a choice of several Lessons for Martyrs were given, a Virgin Martyr could be supplied from them. The Gospel (Matt. xxv. 1-10) is that of R. It seems to have been chosen because of the word virgin. But the

similarity is merely verbal. No stress is laid in the parable on the virginity of the maidservants, and the story is only a vivid way of picturing watching servants. "Virgins" in Church History are those who have been "careful for the things of the Lord" (1 Cor. vii. 34), thanks to the absence of family distractions. The 1928 Collect is based on the parable, but the meaning of Bridegroom applied to a Virgin is not that of the parable and collect. The Virgin is the bride of the heavenly Bridegroom, representing in her dedication the bride-character of the Church (2 Cor. xi. 2.). Indeed, 2 Cor. x. 17-xi. 2. might be borrowed from R for a Virgin not a Martyr. The Communion of R might be used as the Gospel, namely Matt. xiii. 45, 46; if it is thought too short, v. 44 could be added.

Of a Matron is not important, being used only for Monnica and Anne. The Epistle (1 Pet. i. 3-9) and Gospel (Luke x. 38-42) are better than the chapter about the virtuous woman (Prov. xxxi.) or the passage about widows (1 Tim. v), with the Gospel of a Virgin (Matt. xiii. 45, 46), of R.

W. K. L. C.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Ephemerides Theologicæ Lovanienses. January, 1934.

This number opens with a scholastic article on the meaning of *suppositum* and the importance of the notion in its bearing upon the difference between "Nature" and "Person" in the doctrine of the Incarnation. "Nature" generally is *id quo est*, but when nature is completed by subsistence it passes to the state of a *suppositum* or *id quod est*. Christ is truly a Man, but that Man, if He is a Person, is not so *per se* but *per aliud*. To a certain extent, says the author of this article, Fr. J. Winandy, O.S.B., this is the reverse position to what takes place at the consecration in the Eucharist. There the accidents subsist in themselves and no longer in the substances of the bread and the wine, whereas the human substance which is Christ does not subsist by itself but by the Word who has united this nature to Himself. The mode of this union remains impenetrable to the human intellect, but at least we can say that the hypostatic union to be intelligible at all demands the real distinction of essence and existence.

A second article is a very careful treatise on the origins of the Eucharist in the New Testament, examining the work of Zahn, Lietzmann, Brilioth and others. Fr. J. Coppens, the author, concludes that the writers of the New Testament give us the Eucharist as a fully constituted rite, a meeting-place, moreover, of many different lines of thought: for it is historic, looking to the past; eschatological, looking to the future; a fraternal meal; a sacrifice and a sacrament. Brilioth is quoted with approval, and it is claimed that independent critical opinion is moving towards the establishment of the main lines of Catholic tradition.

This is followed by an article by Fr. H. Wagnon, mainly juristic in scope, dealing with the international position of the Papacy at the present day. Among other matters he discusses what new features have been here introduced by the Vatican Treaty of 1929, the international standing of the Vatican City, and so on.

The remainder of the number is occupied with the usual reviews of books and theological bibliography for the quarter, and also a Note on the pronouncements of the present Pope as they affect the "Doctrina Mariana" of the Roman Church.

W. R. V. BRADE.

REVIEWS

LITERATURE AND PULPIT IN MEDIEVAL ENGLAND: A NEGLECTED CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LETTERS AND OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. By G. R. Owst, D.Lit. Cambridge University Press. 30s.

Two capital and related difficulties confront all students of English preaching and are apparent in their work—the curious unwillingness of men of letters to believe that such students have anything to say that can be of importance to the study of English literature, and the composite nature of the material with which their study supplies them, and which renders orderliness of exposition and choice of a significant yet comprehensive title next to impossible. Of three recent pioneers in this field—Dr. Owst himself in his earlier volume *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1926), Miss Richardson in *English Preachers and Preaching 1640-1670: A Secular Study* (1928), and Mr. W. Fraser Mitchell in *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson: A Study of its Literary Aspects* (1932; both S.P.C.K. publications)—none has found a ready audience or can be said to have avoided the charge of heterogeneousness. This is largely the result of the long neglect under which English sermon literature, whether medieval or later, has lain; and those who, in Dr. Owst's phrase, have "wandered from manuscript to manuscript and library to library," not unlike Egyptologists who first peep into the various chambers of a newly discovered tomb, have naturally not confined themselves to the primary object of their quest, but have given a many-sided account of the "God's plenty" which they found.

Dr. Owst is quite frank about his procedure. All is not grist that comes to his mill, but like the most up-to-date machinery his mill is capable of producing grain of different qualities. In the present volume, as the sub-title indicates, he has set out the relations of the English medieval sermon with contemporary English literature and has used the sermon as firsthand evidence for social conditions in the period; but he has not altogether overlooked its implications for ecclesiastical history and the intrinsic interest of its own technique. The two former are his main concerns in this book; the two latter he purposes to return to in a third volume.

Of the justice of the author's complaints of the neglect of sermon-material as evidence germane both to literary criticism and historical research there can be no doubt, nor that English literary and dramatic critics have been even more guilty in this

respect than their French brethren. Truly, in the words of Walton, we live no longer "in the first and most blessed times of Christianity, when the Clergy were looked upon with reverence," and sermons regarded, as they have been in the best periods of preaching, as at once works of art and sources of instruction; and because the sermon is not regarded with favour by our contemporaries there is a tendency on their part to forget that it enjoyed greater honour and exercised a correspondingly greater influence in the days of our ancestors. Dr. Owst's protests against the fatuous and ill-founded conclusions about English medieval literature due to the disinclination of literary critics and historians to examine the sermon-sources available, or to their disbelief that anything of value is to be found in them, are amply justified; but it is to be wished that he had carried over less of the vituperative persistence of some of his medieval preachers in attacking not only the omission but also actual scholars. The nameless preacher in Worcester Cathedral was careful to "speke noyther of Richarde nor of Robert . . . nor of dan Ion" (p. 455); and there must be several among those to whom the author particularly desires to present his case who will read with consternation and regret what Dr. Owst has seen fit to write in more than one place of a deceased gracious and much-loved medieval scholar. Nor is Dr. Owst altogether blameless when it comes to acknowledging what others interested in his own field of study have written; and at least one of the four accounts of English preaching already mentioned, Mr. Fraser Mitchell's *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson*, which appeared more than nine months before the date of Dr. Owst's "Preface" much as the author would have benefited from the information now made available, does definitely attempt to assess the character of English medieval preaching and to trace the influence of that preaching both on form and subject-matter in the work of the late sixteenth and seventeenth century divines.

Of one aspect of Dr. Owst's complaint a word may be said in passing, for it is obviously an aspect which calls for remark, though it is not necessary to indulge in personalities in voicing it. What Dr. Owst really dislikes, and with reason, is the extreme secularization of modern scholarship. The price paid by the Church for excluding Dissenters from the older Universities has been the creation of the modern secular University, one of whose fruits is an apparently growing professoriate whose members do not hold by the old allegiances evident in all the work of so eminent a critic as the late George Saintsbury, and who are prone to regard any utterance of the pulpit, medieval

or modern, as of little concern. In Russia, presumably, the specimens Dr. Owst gives of medieval sermons would find a place on the walls of the anti-God museums, and that with full approval from our professorial friends, who have forgotten that not only Langland but many another has owed much to the pulpit, and that whether we look backwards or forwards from Langland's day, deprived of the inspiration of Christianity European Literature would present a very different face. "The Love that moves the sun and the other stars" is a vastly different thing from "love" as Lucretius conceived it; and it is Heine who reminds us that "Romanticism is a passion-flower springing from the blood of Christ."

A dislike of certain age-old human follies (which reminds one at times of Malvolio) and inability to refrain from expressing that dislike is one of Dr. Owst's weaknesses. It is perhaps true that only students of a serious cast of temperament are likely to make sermon-literature their particular study, and they will consequently always be liable to forget the necessary impartiality which they must observe as scientific investigators in their moral approval of their preachers' attacks on sin. Dr. Owst has betrayed himself in several instances, and he has forgotten at times that he was writing for posterity, to whom his topical allusions will probably be as puzzling as the more out-of-the-way of his preachers' references.

It will perhaps be as well to give an outline of the author's treatment of his subject. From noting Introductory Influences he passes to a discussion of Scripture and Allegory and to the strange medieval Other-World peopled by "The Heavenly Host." A fairly full study of the *Exempla* follows, and this varied sermon-content is then shewn coming to life in what Dr. Owst terms "The Preaching of Satire and Complaint" and illustrates from many angles in three successive chapters. Allegorical characters, the saints and the heroes and heroines of the *exempla* which provided Langland with characters for his poem, are then displayed in process of becoming the *personæ* of the early Drama. A concluding chapter, based upon the common ideals of the preachers and Langland, deals with "the Social Gospel" of Langland's day.

The compositeness of the material dealt with will be evident from this outline, as also the fact that this book, like all others on the English sermon, is rather a collection of material out of which in a more fortunate age a later scholar may fashion a clear and well balanced monograph than itself such a study. It is, therefore, not to be adversely criticized if its contents do not articulate with flawless precision with our knowledge of cognate topics; and Dr. Owst clearly intends his three volumes

to be read with close reference to one another (as is evident from the somewhat disconcerting frequency with which he refers to his previous book), when the loose ends of many topics as they are left at present will no doubt be found gathered up in his concluding volume. It is disconcerting, however, to the student who is trying to see the sermon as a whole, with its roots in classical epideictic oratory, and maintaining a continuity largely of a formal kind, to find so little intimation given of that illustrious ancestry. Dr. Owst rarely mounts higher than St. Bernard in his references, and while he is urgent about the recognition of his own claims that Fiction and Drama alike borrowed incidents and characters from the sermons not only of their own day but of several centuries previous, and that such ready-to-hand material owed little to realism and was almost entirely hermeneutic and scholastic in origin—all which is indisputable—he yet seems inclined to credit the medieval pulpit, now and then, with “the initiation of some new literary conceit” (p. 3), which probably on further investigation might be traceable to a classical pagan source, or, at any rate, an early patristic one. It is almost curious the way in which he avoids pointing the distinguished lineage of the *exemplum*. Neither is its connection with the contemporary study of rhetoric, such as it was, made clear. The preachers not only used *exempla* because these were effective, as Aristotle instructs his pupils, but because they had been practised in the use of them in the monastery-schools and Universities. They used the traditional ones, not because they were unable to invent as good, but because it was expected of them—the references to Avicenna (pp. 351, 550) as well as to Christian teachers goes to prove this—much as scraps of Latin and Greek, and even Hebrew, were looked for by seventeenth-century parishioners as proofs of their preachers’ education. The well-known incident of Pococke the Orientalist being objected to as “insufficient” because he declined to regale a village congregation with such quotations illustrates how matters stood in the latter century. A liking for *exempla*, although it could not find such definite means of expression, was no doubt typical of the earlier period. Moreover, as Dr. Owst has shewn, in many instances the *exempla* degenerated into the *facetiae* (pp. 166-7). Not unnaturally, the latter, and to a large extent the former also, passed out of favour in England at the Reformation, when severely logical exposition of Scripture began to be in vogue, though Latimer—who is really a medieval—continued to use them with quite as much boisterous effect as the friars, and as late as 1615, in a sermon at Paul’s Cross, John White, a rigid Calvinist, retailed a most lively *exemplum*, drawn from Athenæus, of a

party of gallants who having drunk deeply mistook the ale-house where they were for a galley at sea.

When English preaching breathed again after the logic and polemics of the Reformation the *exemplum* in its anecdotal form had been discarded, though Dr. Owst's reminder (pp. 151-5) that the term was used by medieval homilists to cover "example," "narration," "figure," and other similar devices, warns us that the anecdote involving actors—real, supernatural, animal—was by no means the sole form of the *exemplum*; and the "Panonian bears" or the stags frozen knee-deep in a Greek river, and other bizarre and beautiful "instances" of Jeremy Taylor, are of a related order.

Much that Dr. Owst has shewn to be typical of medieval preaching survived into the seventeenth century, and an acquaintance with English medieval sermons (hitherto, except for Cardinal Gasquet's essays, largely unknown to us) may very well account for the subject-matter of famous preachers in that century, though the possibility of a common source in still earlier Continental preachers or the Fathers renders doubtful to whom they were certainly indebted. There can be little doubt, however, that Henry Smith and Adams and many another Puritan owed much of their vividness and colour to an acquaintance with earlier English preaching long unknown to us; and while Donne derived many of his themes direct from St. Augustine or Tertullian he quite as definitely learned much from the way in which medieval preachers had handled these same themes. Here, too, the Elizabethan pamphleteers, notably Dekker, appear as beneficiaries of the older pulpit, and "the stoney-paven bridal-bower of the grave" from which Antigone recoiled, with its corrupting flesh and crawling worms and evil-smelling damp, to which the vain and luxurious are described as travelling, as portrayed by preacher and pamphleteer alike, is the charnel-house of the medieval sermon.

Of later preachers Adams was undoubtedly the most medieval. His "Devills Banket (Banquet)"—a series of six sermons—introduces us to various Elizabethan or Jacobean types in much the same way as many a nameless medieval monk and friar introduces us to the contemporaries of Piers. The figures that are thrown upon the surface of the Sea of Glass in Heaven, as described in "The Spiritual Navigator," or the characters that are paraded for the hearers' entertainment in "Mysticall Bedlam"—both of date 1615—though they affect the fashions of the reign of James I. are near of kin to those in the "Field Full of Folk"; while the disease diagnosed in "The Soules Sicknesse" (1616) and other English sermons drawing largely upon medical imagery, noted by Robinson, the translator in 1788

of Claude's *Essay on Composition of a Sermon* (vol. ii., p. 189, note), as occurring in the period 1551-92, are paralleled by those cited in a sermon by Master Rypon of Durham, a contemporary of Chaucer, from whom we are given a quotation (p. 30). Again, in his "Divine Herball" (1616), Adams is treading hard on the heels of the same Rypon and other medieval preachers in his description of the properties of herbs and their "divine" or spiritual analogues. Dr. Owst, however, has broken new ground and opened up an important field of enquiry by tracing to the medieval sermon and its fondness for instances drawn from natural history, real or fictitious, the beginning of popular interest in that study. Professor Foster Watson, in his *English Grammar Schools to 1660* and elsewhere, has demonstrated that both History and Geography took their rise from illustrative or moralistic matter collected by young students in preparing themes or orations for schools or Universities. It is quite clear that the sermon did much to preserve and increase the stock of such information, and Dr. Owst's contention (pp. 189 *seq.*) that the interest of the hearers passed from the *exempla quæ exempla* to the fields of enquiry from which they were drawn is a valuable contribution to the early history of the rise of particular subjects of study. Obviously the medieval preacher, like the classical orator before him, was expected to have an encyclopædic knowledge upon which to draw for argument and illustration and himself prepared the way for the specialists of the modern world.

It is perhaps almost unfair, having the author's purposes in view, to remark on the scanty attention he has given to the formal side of his subject, a defect which his third volume promises to make good. Like Mr. Fraser Mitchell in his study of the seventeenth-century preachers he has discovered Bloom's *Pulpit Oratory in the Time of James the First* and appreciated its merits (p. 100). Naturally, he has been inclined to emphasize the medieval deposit in it, whereas some students might be inclined to argue from it, as indeed from all specimens of medieval preaching, that the medieval has little original about it except its emotional reorientation, and that the real importance of medieval vernacular preaching lies in the skill with which it conveyed a transitional classicism to the different European nations with their growing self-consciousness (of which Dr. Owst makes much, p. 131 and elsewhere) and need for a fluent and adequate form of speech. The debt of all modern national literatures, especially on their linguistic and syntactical side, to medieval pulpit oratory is very great and deserves emphasizing, and we "who speak the tongue that Shakespeare spake" echo, in doing so, not only the greatest of our own race,

but "that old man eloquent" whom Cicero acknowledged as his master, and "from whose school as from the Trojan horse," strangely disguised at times, it is true, all through the Middle Ages, "many great men were brought forth."

Where there is so much of importance and value there is a temptation to overlook occasional blemishes, but a protest appears to be required against Dr. Owst's habit of inserting an exclamation mark in brackets (*e.g.*, pp. 62, 67, 125) after words or ideas that appeal to his sense of the ludicrous; and even granting that we of modern times have been deprived of several species of song-birds familiar to our ancestors, the tortoise can hardly be described as "a familiar object of the English countryside" (p. 199). The precise meaning of "person" in English is open to debate, and for that reason the term is best left alone; nor does Dr. Owst help any in elucidating the meaning by referring to S. R. Maitland as "that well-intentioned person" (p. 235). "The grandees of the modern popular story-books" (p. 309) remains an unintelligible phrase; and a footnote (p. 410) explanatory of "daggede" or foliated hoods, which reads: "a fashion said to have been introduced c. 1346," but which gives no source for this date, comes oddly from the pen of a historian.

It is pleasant to be able to close with a further reference to Izaak Walton, who describes Donne as "always preaching to himself, like an angel from a cloud, but in none"—a remark which has a curiously traditional ring about it—and to note what Dr. Owst has to say of one medieval comment on this as a preaching ideal (p. 578). May he yet be able to trace the image to its source!

W. F. M.

NOTICES

EUSEBIUS PAMPHILI. By F. J. Foakes-Jackson. Heffer. 4s 6d. 1933.

Professor Foakes-Jackson has been a student of Church History for more than forty years. In this little volume he writes, as a scholar sometimes does at the end of life, with a nonchalance—almost a negligence—which indicates a weight of learning easily borne. Eusebius of Cæsarea, a dull but most useful historian, has evidently interested the Professor for a long time, and he apparently hoped to produce a big work on the most learned of the fourth-century Greek writers. This has not been possible, and what we have is a compact little book, which probably supplies as much that is practically useful as a heavy and closely documented tome. The ecclesiastical and political background of Eusebius' own time is first sketched; then follows an account of the Bishop's life, and three essays on the "History," the "Life of Constantine" and "other works." A most

useful note on Eusebius' chronology supplements these lectures, which were delivered at Lennoxville (Canada) and at Strasbourg, when they made the author a doctor there in 1933. Dr. T. R. Glover passed the proofs, so that we may be sure that no spiteful humanist will be able to find much fault with our genial Professor's work.

A. J. MACDONALD.

ITALY AND THE REFORMATION TO 1550. By G. K. Brown, M.A., Ph.D.
Basil Blackwell. 18s. 1933.

In this book, which is his first publication, Mr. Brown has rendered a real service to English readers. He has ransacked original and secondary authorities in six languages, and presents in a compact form a mass of information not attainable elsewhere. He writes in an impartial spirit, and the susceptibilities of the most fastidious are not likely to be offended by his calm review of stirring action and passionate utterance belonging to a controversial period of Church history.

A strong "lay tradition," coming down from classical times, influenced Italian ecclesiastical thought and practice. The Roman Church established its spiritual monarchy not so much by the aid of theology as by law, by absorbing the principles of ancient Roman jurisprudence. For this reason reform of the Church was not to be expected from within. No canonist ever headed a reform party. The old lay tradition manifested itself again in the humanism of the Renaissance, which never became purely Christian even while it did not remain purely classical. Again, no leader for Church reform could be expected to appear in Italian Renaissance circles.

The soil on which the principles of Luther—although not of Calvin, save at Ferrara—were to be sown was provided by the "rebel tradition" maintained by the Italian Vandois, Patarines, and Cathari. There was ground enough for the reception of these principles, for "the Renaissance of pagan glories led to the resuscitation of pagan crimes," even in ecclesiastical circles. Yet during the first half of the sixteenth century there was in Italy a latitude allowed to innovating teaching never sanctioned in Spain. The demand of the sectaries for reform was reinforced within the Church by organizations like that of the Friars Minor.

Mr. Brown sketches the reform movement in Piemonte, the Milanese and Mantua, in Modena and Ferrara, in Venetia and Venice itself, in Friuli and Istria, in Tuscany, the Papal States and Naples. The Lutherans were described as "Evangelicals" about 1540 in the Papal States. This survey is accompanied by interesting biographical details of leading reforming personages—Guilia Gonzaga, Ochino, Valdes and others. An important chapter describes the efforts of Contarini, Morone, Sadoletto, Pole and other Catholic leaders who attempted to embody certain Lutheran principles within the reform programme of the Church. They did not meet with much success. For example, the works even of Contarini appear on the index of Parma for 1580. The only native reforming teaching which hails from Italy was that of the Spaniard Sozzino, who derived his ideas from the Italian Servedo. Yet, if little was achieved in Italy for the reform of the teaching of the Church, much was secured in the sphere of practice. When the Reformation in Italy rallied the forces of reaction the Church was compelled to reshape and readjust her practical life and piety.

A. J. MACDONALD.

ALBAN BUTLER, "THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS." Vol. IV. April. A new edition by Herbert Thurston and Norah Leeson. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 1933. 7s. 6d.

English readers may find much to trouble them in this book. It represents a view and treatment of the Christian cultus which have their roots far back in race history, when the human mind functioned in a very primitive and naïve manner. They will also note that whereas full justice is done to the sufferings of Roman Catholic Martyrs, not even a passing allusion pays tribute to the equally heroic sufferings of the victims of the Inquisition, or of the fires of Smithfield. Nor does it supply a hint of the political activities of Roman Catholic agents, save in the case of the Gunpowder Plot.

Yet the volume maintains the high standard of its predecessors as a mine of historical minutiae. It pays considerable attention to historical veracity, although Lanfranc is still called "Abbot" of Bec, and Gregory VII is still allowed to have received part of his training at Cluny. A certain discreet warning about hagiographical details repeatedly occurs, and whenever the author and editors are not hampered by hagiography, sound historical writing appears, as in the account of Anselm of Canterbury. An adequate list of authorities is supplied with every biography.

A. J. MACDONALD.

BLESSED LOUISE DE MARILLAC. By Prince Emmanuel de Broglie. Translated by Joseph Leonard, C.M. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.

When we were young, we read hardly any lives of the saints. Saints, in those days, did not seem attractive. They were to be found in such curious places: on tops of pillars, in caves, in remote deserts; and they did the most incomprehensible things, such as confessing faults they had not committed, loading their bodies with chains, strewing ashes on their food, or refusing to lift their eyes from the ground even to look at their own mothers. Even if we had wanted to imitate them, and to become saints ourselves, it would have been impossible. Ordinary people could not change their nature and become saints, any more than they could become mermaids or archangels.

Then, somehow, a rumour got abroad that the saints had been born quite ordinary babies. Some were clever, some stupid; some were robust, some were weakly; some high-born, some the children of peasants. Many of the saints had ardent natures which led them to extremes in the service of Him Whom they loved, but the majority were distinguished by a holy reasonableness in all that they did. Moreover, the saints, both men and women, were to be found everywhere—in kings' courts as in the slums, in drawing-rooms and parliaments as in the cloister.

Early biographers and modern psychologists alike have conspired to emphasize the extraordinary and the startling characteristics of holy men, but in spite of them the opinion is gaining ground that the measure of a saint is his saintliness, rather than some external manifestations of an inner power.

Prince de Broglie is a discriminating biographer, and he puts this charming French gentlewoman before us, as we would willingly see her, in all the beauty and simplicity of her true character. She is remembered as the co-foundress, with St. Vincent de Paul, of the Sisters of Charity; of that society of devoted women who have "for their only monastery

the homes of the sick, for their chapel their parish church, for their cloister the streets or the wards of a hospital, for a grille the fear of God, for their veil holy modesty." Louise de Marillac is the mother of thousands and thousands of spiritual daughters whose slate-grey dress and white cornette are known today all over the Catholic world.

There is little that is picturesque and nothing that is eccentric about this quiet lady. Louise was somewhat delicate all her life, and, until God gave her courage, of a timid and scrupulous character. She used to worry over her husband's health and her son's morals, like many another wife and mother. She seemed marked out by nature for no high destiny, but God, Who calls whom He wills, desired her to be a saint.

Louise had always loved the poor, seeing in each one of them the lineaments of our Lord Himself. During the lifetime of her husband, when she was still bound by her "devoirs d'état," she received a divine intimation that the time would come when she should be set free to serve God in ways yet unknown to her, and take the threefold vows in His honour. All that she had to do was to be prepared. So when "M. Vincent" needed an instrument for his work, he found one ready to his hand. The labours of St. Vincent de Paul are too well known to need recalling here. The statue of him, holding a foundling in his arms, is familiar to everyone. The "charités" which he and Louise founded spread widely over France and ministered to the needs of the sick and poor in their own homes, and in hospitals where the conditions were indescribably squalid. Schools in remote villages were founded and maintained; and the brutalized and neglected galley-slaves were cared for by Louise and her helpers.

This young gentlewoman, brought up to a life of softness and of ease, would travel the length and breadth of France, now in a farm cart, now on horseback, now in an open boat, to encourage her Daughters of Charity, ministering to their souls as skilfully as she organized their affairs.

What made her a saint? She was not by nature heroic, nor apparently of a particularly contemplative disposition. "Sanctity," Prince de Broglie reminds us, "is nothing else than the Christian religion practised to perfection." Louise de Marillac united her will to the will of God—He gave her holiness.

Reading this biography, the question occurs to us, Was not every Christian intended to be a saint? Those dear old ladies in the front pews; the retired colonel who reads the lessons; that rather cheeky choir boy; those factory girls who have begun to attend early celebration—ought they not all to be saints? And you? And I? Ah! God help us all!

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE ESSENCE OF PLATO'S PHILOSOPHY. By Constantin Ritter, Professor of Philosophy at Tübingen. Translated by Adam Alles. Allen and Unwin. 16s.

There has been quite a number of books on Plato and Platonism published during the last few years. First—and foremost—Prof. A. E. Taylor's fine study, *Plato, the Man and his Work* (1926, 3rd ed. 1929); secondly, a volume by Prof. Field, *Plato and his Contemporaries* (1930); a volume by the late Prof. Burnet a couple of years previously; and, lastly, two small books on Socrates, issued last year, the one by Taylor, the other by Mr. F. M. Cornford. Ritter's work was originally published

in 1931, and contains the "essence" of that eminent Platonist's monumental work on Plato in two volumes (1910, 1923). He is so well known to Platonic scholars that no introduction is needed; but to a large number of philosophical students he has hitherto largely remained unknown. Mr. Alles was well advised to undertake the rather formidable task of translating into readable English a difficult German original, and he has done his work with skill and care. But even in an English dress the book is not to be read without continuous attention; the reader cannot afford to indulge in the art of "skipping." The book is close-packed throughout; indeed, it is a marvel of condensation. We "unpack"—slowly—as we go. For English readers, certainly, it will not displace Taylor's masterly work; and perhaps necessarily so, as it is contrived on somewhat different lines. Taylor is fuller in detailed treatment of each dialogue; Ritter aims chiefly at giving a coherent presentation of Plato's philosophy as a whole. It is interesting to note, *inter alia*, that he regards the *Theætetus* as marking the moment when Plato began definitely to detach himself from the purely Socratic position he had, more or less, previously held; and he dates this dialogue as having been written somewhere about the year 368; the *Republic* he assigns to the years 375-2. Up to the time of the *Theætetus* he believes the basic content of the dialogues to be Socratic. But where Socrates ends and Plato begins—well, who can be certain? It is hard to believe that Plato's divergence from his master did not begin earlier than even the *Republic*, though (as Cornford remarks) the central germ of Platonism all along the line is "the new Socratic morality." The theory of Ideas is handled by Prof. Ritter with incessant vigilance—as, indeed, it deserves to be, for it is vital to the Platonic system. That theory was continually developing under Plato's hands as his experience of the world deepened and became enriched by contact with other thinkers, his object being to complete the work adumbrated by his master in discovering the "generic notions" of all things whatsoever. His main error—according to the great Hegelian, Dr. Hutchison Starling—was so to hypostatize the Ideas that they appeared only in isolation from the concrete. They never really moved. All these and many other questions of great interest (and great difficulty) are dealt with in this learned and searching investigation of Platonic philosophy by the German thinker; and we are extremely glad that his book has, so soon after its appearance on the Continent, been made available for English readers.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

DIE KATHOLISCHE WIEDERGEBOURT DER ENGLISCHEN KIRCHE. By Dr. Paula Schaefer. Ernest Reinhardt, München. M. 4.50.

Descriptions of English religion by foreigners are always interesting, and this is specially so, since the gifted authoress belongs to the Anglican Communion. Her detailed description of the Catholic Revival is accurate and sympathetic to a degree that would have been impossible to an outsider. There are a few slips and misplaced emphases. Pusey is not a good example of an ascetic whose life was tuned to a cheerful note ("auf einen heiteren Ton"). The religious orders would hardly recognize themselves as "Stosstruppen" (storm-troops), nor was Bishop Butler exactly a "High Church theologian." The English Church Union would rub its eyes in wonder to find itself "the most powerful ecclesiastical and

religious organization of the British Reich." But these are tiny details. The mass of difficult material has been handled in a way that deserves the highest praise. Dr. Schaefer is particularly successful in discerning the recent tendencies of Anglicanism; she is struck by the admission of coloured bishops and the determination to get rid of race prejudice. Germans, she thinks, have much to learn from the way in which a kindred race with strongly marked national characteristics has assimilated Christianity. Indeed, "for the Westerner of Germanic extraction, who has recognized the truth and the New Testament basis of the fundamental Catholic ideas, Anglicanism is the ideal Church." The only fault in the book is that the convert sees us through rose-coloured spectacles, and does not help us to see our faults. When she knows us still better she will be able to help us more. But what a splendid book for the German public!

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

ON THE POWER OF GOD. (The *De Potentia* of St. Thomas Aquinas.)
Translated by the English Dominican Fathers. Vol. II. London:
Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 1933. 7s. 6d.

Interest in the philosophy of the Schoolmen continues to spread. The confusion of tongues which is evident in modern philosophical discussion is sending more and more seekers after truth back to a study of St. Thomas Aquinas. They are coming to realize that, while his scientific ideas are admittedly obsolete, his metaphysical views are sound and abiding. Modern philosophical systems come and go, like fashions in dress, but true philosophy cannot completely change from century to century; thoroughgoing relativism is an error.

We have for some time been indebted to the English Dominican Fathers for their translations of the *Summa Theologica* and the *Summa Contra Gentiles*. Now they have translated for us the important but less known work, *On the Power of God*. Vol. II. has recently appeared. It contains among other things an interesting discussion on miracles. This volume will be welcomed by all lovers of that philosophy which, in the words of the late Cardinal Mercier, "grips facts and holds fast to them when it is brought into play in the domain of metaphysics, when it soars to the Absolute."

H. S. BOX.

SCIENCE, RELIGION AND MAN. By W. J. J. Cornelius, M.A., B.D., D.Lit.,
D.Sc., A.K.C. London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd. 1934. 15s.

Here we have a veritable encyclopædia of information on matters of religious belief and practice. Its very wide range, which indeed is indicated by the title itself, makes it a difficult task to do justice to the work in a review. The numerous subjects dealt with or touched upon include the existence of God, creation, immortality, evolution, religious worship in Babylonia and Assyria, Greek genius, mediæval Christianity, the dangers of Bolshevism, Satan-worship, and Seventh Day Adventism. It must be confessed that this book presents a certain appearance of disjointedness—we can hardly expect it to do otherwise when we consider the extent of its subject-matter—so that it seems to be a book of reference rather than one to read straight through, but its usefulness and value are by no means thereby diminished. Its purpose is "to give to those who are interested in origins, developments and issues as they affect human

life some ideas, facts and suggestions on which progressive study can be built. Much that is here presented," says the author, "is common knowledge, but I expect there is also a deal of matter which is somewhat unfamiliar to those busy workers in the world who have small leisure for deep study, but who are keen to know what has been discovered by accredited scholars of this and other ages."

H. S. Box.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE BALKANS. By Matthew Spinka.

The American Society of Church History, Chicago. S.P.C.K. 16s.

The writer treats of the rise of Slavic Christianity in the Balkans down to the time of the Turkish conquest. It is a scholarly work on a subject little known to English readers. In a book of some 200 pages the author gives us an immense amount of information, both political and ecclesiastical, and his facts are so closely packed together that the book is not one for desultory reading. It is a matter of pride to the Balkan Churches that Christianity was introduced into the Balkan peninsula by the Great Apostle of the Gentiles, who saw in a vision the man of Macedonia calling for his help. The labourers who entered upon the Apostle's work are unknown for the most part, but it was due to them that Christianity spread among the Illyrian, Thracian, and Hellenic people.

The Slavs pushed south owing to pressure from the Goths and settled in the provinces of Dacia and Moesia Inferior; in 851 they had penetrated to Achaia, Thessaly, and Thrace. At first they were just a number of military groups pursuing their own ends, but later developed a centralized government. By the beginning of the seventh century the Serbo-Croatians were firmly established on the Save and Drave rivers, where they made a permanent home. The coming of the uncivilized Slavs put an end to much of the Græco-Roman civilization which they found in the territory they had occupied. City life was distasteful to men of wild and rustic habits. Great uncertainty exists as to the time of the conversion of the first Slav settlers. We are told that great impetus was given to their conversion by the two "Apostles of the Slavs," Cyril and Methodius. Other Christian teachers had been at work, notably in Pannonia and Moldavia, so the way had been opened for the new faith. The real success of the first teachers was indirectly due to the influence of St. Cyril, who framed a Slavonic alphabet and translated the Gospels for the new converts. Within a century of his time, Serbia, Croatia, and Dalmatia were not only Christian, but Orthodox lands.

The conversion of Serbia took place in the reign of Mutimir in the ninth century. The Emperor Basil I. sent a number of priests to teach the people. It was not till later that we have the first mention of an episcopal see at Rascia, which was placed under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Dyrrhachium. At the same time there existed in the country several episcopal sees of the Latin Church, which did not make for unity, and the spread of Christianity was retarded. Under the Grand-Zupan Stephen Nemanya (1618-95) the eastern territories clung to the Orthodox Patriarch, while the western regions were predominantly Latin. The organizer of the autocephalous Serbian Church was undoubtedly Sava, who was strong enough to resist the leaning of Stephen and his Venetian wife towards Rome. He made the Church safe for Orthodoxy and worked to secure its independence. If it is true that Stephen Nemanya created the Serbian

dynasty, it is also true that the Church owes its spiritual life to the labours of St. Sava. The author gives a very full account of the history of Bulgaria, and of the conversion of King Boris. When the Emperor Michael invaded Bulgaria in 864, Boris was in great difficulty owing to a severe famine; finding himself unable to resist the imperial forces, he offered his submission. The demands made by the Emperor included an acceptance of Christianity and an acknowledgment of the imperial sovereignty, although Bulgaria was allowed to retain its autonomy. The Patriarch Photius sent a mission of bishops and clergy to teach the new faith, and Boris and many of his nobles were baptized. The constant struggle for ecclesiastical independence is clearly dealt with; the Church passed many times from independence to subjection. In the end the State became subject to the Turks, and the Church to the Greeks. It was not until 1767 that the Bulgars recovered their independence and today remain an autonomous Church, out of communion with the Œcumenical Patriarch, but in communion with the rest of the Orthodox world. The effort was made again and again by the Empire to conquer the Slavs; sometimes it succeeded. In the end it failed. But where the Empire could not plant its rule, it gave its religion to the people, and so we see that "Byzantinization and Christianization were two aspects of the same process." When the new religion was preached in their language the people received it. With the change of religion came Byzantine culture and learning. The Slavs became spiritually assimilated to the Byzantine culture despite the fact that they retained their own language and political independence. If the Slavs originally conquered the imperial provinces of the Danube, the Byzantine religion and culture in the end conquered them. This was a service of no mean order.

F. N. HEAZELL.

ANCIENT ITALY AND MODERN RELIGION. By Robert Seymour Conway. Cambridge University Press. 1933. Pp. ix+150. Illustrations. 10s. 6d. net.

Shortly before his lamented death R. S. Conway was invited to become Hibbert Lecturer for 1932, and being left free by the will of the founder to deal with "any subject bearing on the history of Christianity," it was natural for him to select some aspect of the studies he had adorned for so many years. Having come to the conclusion that the religion of the Italian peoples outside Rome had not been without its influence on the ideas which Europe took over and re-evaluated with Christianity at the beginning of our era, he set to work to establish connections between Christian and pre-Christian practices, and also between ancient and modern ethical problems in this area.

Taking first the obscure cult of the Venetian goddess Rehtia, an examination of the Iguvian Tables reveals a Liturgy of a priestly brotherhood conforming in its essential structure to the general pattern of mystery cults. In the modern festival of the Elevation of the *Ceri*, held on May 15 under the patronage of the bishop of the diocese, he discerns a survival of the ancient Iguvine rite. The double peregrination of the town of Gubbio with the image of St. Ubaldo, a twelfth-century bishop of the see canonized in 1192, carried on a wooden erection known as the *cero*, points, he thinks, to a combination of two ancient rites preserved in the Liturgy, while the division of the *cero* into an upper and lower quasi-cylindrical box with rails corresponds to the two storeys of the wicker framework

containing a sacrificial victim in the third storey in the earlier cult. He then proceeds to shew that both rites are typical of the Italian religious outlook.

After a discussion of Orphism in Italy along lines familiar to those acquainted with Kern's *Orphicorum fragmenta*, he proceeds to a consideration of the Etruscan influence on Roman beliefs as illustrated by the tomb-paintings. This leads him to the conclusion that it was from this source that the conception of the deity as being above all a lover of vengeance and human blood was "stamped deeply upon the imagination of the people of Rome, and upon the form of Christianity which Rome was to convey to the world." It is this, in his opinion, that lies behind the forensic theory of the Atonement which "thoughtful students of Christian doctrine have long felt to be a barbarizing influence in the Protestant as well as in the Roman Church."

The religious and ethical outlook of Vergil next comes under review. It was he who pressed Greek tradition into the service of Roman and Italian life, the Greek myths being more human than Italian folklore, and the beautiful works of art in which they are often enshrined give them an æsthetic value just as the stories are linked to some of the greatest works of Greek poetry. These qualities enabled them to have a revitalizing effect on the expiring cult, while the poet's insistence on human affection prepared the way, it is contended, for the proclamation of a Gospel based on the faith that God is love.

The last chapter is devoted to the part played by Vergil in foretelling the birth of Christ in the Fourth Eclogue. This poem, composed before the birth of what was hoped to be an heir to Octavian, had a Messianic significance inasmuch as it set forth the hope of the approach of a new era, a golden age of peace, and as the Saturnalia was transformed into the Christmas Festival so the Eclogue became an integral part of the prophetic revelation of the Incarnation. But since Conway first put forth his theory in 1907 much work has been done in this field of research.

If some of the parallels suggested in these lectures are rather forced and the subject-matter of little independent value, each chapter contains material that cannot fail to interest and stimulate the thoughtful reader.

E. O. JAMES.

THE MEANING AND TRUTH OF RELIGION. By Eugene William Lyman.
Charles Scribner's Sons. 12s. 6d.

This is a long book of some 460 pages, treating of Religious Experience, Religious Knowledge and Religious Beliefs. It covers an immense amount of ground, quoting freely from a large number of writers, many of whom are American and not likely to be very well known to an English reader; but writers such as Whitehead, Eddington and A. E. Taylor are also laid under contribution. Such aspects of the general problem of Religion as the Being and Nature of God, Transcendence, Purpose in the Universe and Immortality are given full discussion. The writer sums up in favour of Ethical Theism, "God as a Cosmic Moral Will." This, rather than Pantheism or any of the other forms of belief discussed, is the most satisfying to the religious consciousness. The last section, entitled "The Beloved Community," envisages how true religion should work itself out in the world of men, establishing there a "worldwide community in which reason and love prevail." There are of course many difficulties in the way, not least from the side of nationalism and of class

dissensions. Mr. Lyman concludes that "a faith which discovers that the transcendent God, who is the ultimate creative ground of the universe and whose inherent nature is Truth, Beauty and Goodness, is also immanent in human aspirations and idealistic strivings and is most manifested in human personalities completely dedicated to the building of the Beloved Community . . . can make religion both the supreme way to spiritual fulfilment and the supreme spring of spiritual power for mankind through the ages."

W. R. V. BRADE.

BOOK NOTES

The Liturgical Altar. By Geoffrey Webb. Washbourne and Bogan, Ltd. 5s. Here is a singularly beautiful and valuable little book which, though written for the priests of the Roman Communion, deserves to be carefully studied by those of our own Communion who persist in maintaining the Roman standards of an age that is passing away. I wish that there were space, and that it could be considered fair, to print here a catena of quotations. But I would urge that the book should be bought, and that its lessons should be learned page by page. This is the central theme: The altar itself is of paramount importance, and not its accessories. When these latter are brought into prominence, it is at the expense of the principal and main object, and, "in consequence, we see altars which from the nave are indistinguishable from an erection of gradines, flower vases, candlesticks, and an elaborate throne, to which the altar itself becomes merely a pediment or support" (p. 23). O. H.

The Gospel Sacraments. By J. K. Mozley, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 3s. 6d. Three lectures delivered by Dr. Mozley in Westminster Abbey during Advent, 1932, are here supplemented by a chapter on the Sacramental Church and a concluding section on Worship and the Eucharist. Sound teaching is expressed with the utmost clearness, so that readers who humbly suppose themselves to be incapable of understanding books written by real scholars need have no fear about attempting to master this one. It ought certainly to fulfil the author's hope that what he has written "may make for understanding, if not for agreement, rather than for controversy."

I believe in God. By Peter Green. Longmans. 6s. A welcome "omnibus" containing *Our Heavenly Father, Our Lord and Saviour*, and *The Holy Ghost: The Comforter*.

The Story of the Prayer Book. By Percy Dearmer. Oxford University Press. 5s. *Everyman's History of the Prayer Book* has had so large a circulation and is so well known that this new and thoroughly revised edition needs no comment except one of unstinted praise. In its new form it is better than ever, a masterpiece of lucidity. The ninety-seven illustrations are superb both in choice and execution.

Christian Ideals in Daily Life. By F. G. Belton. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d. Canon Belton's papers in the *Church Times* are much appreciated. Here some of them are collected in book form.

Every Man's Bible. An anthology arranged with an Introduction by Dean Inge. 3s. 6d. A second and cheaper edition of a book which has every merit except that of a satisfactory title. "Every Man's Bible" is, or should be, the Holy Bible handed down to us by our fathers in the faith.

Our space does not permit us to do more than chronicle the appearance of a good many pamphlets published by the Catholic Literature Association. Five anti-Secularist tracts by authors of the calibre of Kenneth Ingram and J. G. Lockhart. A series of penny tracts for villages, etc. Pilgrims' Handbooks to the tombs of St. Cuthbert and St. Bede, and of St. Frideswide, the Shrine of St. David, and the resting-place of the head of Blessed Thomas More (3d. each). Pamphlets on *Women and the Priesthood* (3d.), *Towards Old Age* (6d.), and *Catholic Customs* (6d.). The direction in the last, that clergy wearing birettas uncover their heads entirely when the name of Jesus is mentioned in a sermon, and lift their birettas at the name of the B.V.M. or the Saint of the day, is worth recording. Presumably there are some who would be edified thereby, but to most of us such customs are fussy, and therefore distasteful. *Sacramental Devotions: An Explanation by a Group of Members of F.C.P.* (3d.) should not be missed.

Christ Rescued. By W. Hegemann. Skeffington. 6s. This curious book is interesting as shewing German mentality. The main purpose is to combat traditional views of the Cross, such as are pictorially represented in Dürer's woodcuts. The scene is laid in a villa in Naples, where Philip Vivian, Prof. Wendland, Bernard Shaw, Johannes Weiss, Sir James Frazer, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and others turn up and discourse in passages taken from their books or otherwise fairly summarizing their views. The Dean of Exeter is quoted as saying "a very interesting book," but to most readers the literary device will seem bizarre.

Novum Testamentum Græce et Latine. Edidit. A. Merk., S.J. Rome Pontifical Institute. Lire 18. This is a marvel of beautiful printing. In a volume of about 1,700 pages of handy size, the Greek and Latin versions of the New Testament are set out on opposite pages. There is a full critical apparatus, and maps are added. No more delightful companion for the scholar's desk can be imagined. The bold Greek type stands out beautifully against the thin yet opaque cream paper.

The World of the New Testament. By T. R. Glover. *Something Beyond.* By A. F. Webling. Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d. The "Cambridge Miscellany" provides a welcome addition to the too few intelligent books of pocket size which one can buy *ad libitum* without seriously encumbering one's shelves. Professor Glover's book was first published in 1931. Mr. Webling's curious but very attractive book was reviewed in our columns in January, 1932.

The Group Movement. By H. Hensley Henson, D.D., Bishop of Durham. Second edition. Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d. This book was reviewed by us in June, 1933. The second edition has a lengthy Preface dealing with the latest developments. The Groups on their side deny that their movement can ever be understood from the outside.

Grace Abounding: Sermons for Lent and Easter. By R. J. Campbell, D.D. Skeffington. 3s. 6d. Those who come to this book expecting excellent sermons, carefully planned and persuasive, will not be disappointed.

The Way of the Queen. By Fr. Martin Dempsey. Washbourne and Bogan. 3s. 6d. A well written book in honour of the Virgin Mary, inspired by the desire to make England in a real sense "Mary's Dowry."